



AGENDA
RIO DELL CITY COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING – 6:30 P.M.
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2015
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
675 WILDWOOD AVENUE, RIO DELL

WELCOME . . . By your presence in the City Council Chambers, you are participating in the process of representative government. Copies of this agenda, staff reports and other material available to the City Council are available at the City Clerk's office in City Hall, 675 Wildwood Avenue. Your City Government welcomes your interest and hopes you will attend and participate in Rio Dell City Council meetings often.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Office of the City Clerk at (707) 764-3532. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to assure accessibility to this meeting.

THE TYPE OF COUNCIL BUSINESS IS IDENTIFIED IMMEDIATELY AFTER EACH TITLE IN BOLD CAPITAL LETTERS

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
- D. CEREMONIAL MATTERS
- E. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

This time is for persons who wish to address the Council on any matter not on this agenda and over which the Council has jurisdiction. As such, a dialogue with the Council or staff is not intended. Items requiring Council action not listed on this agenda may be placed on the next regular agenda for consideration if the Council directs, unless a finding is made by at least 2/3rds of the Councilmembers present that the item came up after the agenda was posted and is of an urgency nature requiring immediate action. Please limit comments to a maximum of 3 minutes.

- F. CONSENT CALENDAR

The Consent Calendar adopting the printed recommended Council action will be enacted with one vote. The Mayor will first ask the staff, the public, and the Council members if there is anyone who wishes to address any matter on the Consent Calendar. The matters removed from the Consent Calendar will be considered individually in the next section, "SPECIAL CALL ITEMS".

- 1) 2015/10.06.01 - Approve Minutes of the September 22, 2015 Special Meeting
(ACTION) 1
- 2) 2015/10.06.02 - Authorize Finance Director to sign and submit Regional Surface
Transportation Program (RSTP) Claim for FY 2014-2015
(ACTION) 17
- 3) 2015/1006.03 - Approve Resolution No. 1273-2015 amending Section 3.24 (Nepotism)
and Section 5.15 (Sick Leave) of the City of Rio Dell Employee
Handbook (ACTION) 33

G. ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR

H. SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS/STUDY SESSIONS

I. SPECIAL CALL ITEMS/COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

- 1) 2015/1006.04 - Adopt Resolution No. 1271-2015 establishing procedures for the
conduct of protest hearings pursuant to Proposition 218 for new
or increased property related fees and charges and direct staff to
proceed with the Prop 218 45-day noticing process (ACTION) 36
- 2) 2015/1006.05 - Local transportation revenue options being considered by the
Humboldt County Association of Governments (HCAOG) Policy
Advisory Committee (DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION) 49
- 3) 2015/1006.06 - Electronic Signage for display on City Hall grounds
(DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION) 98
- 4) 2015/1006.07 - Authorize City Manager to cast votes on behalf of the City of Rio Dell
for the Fortuna Fire Protection District's ballot assessments
(DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION) 99
- 5) 2015/1006.08 - Update on Code Enforcement Program (DISCUSSION) 104
- 6) 2015/1006.09 - Authorize City Manager to investigate the placement of a fence
blocking pedestrian river/bridge access at Eagle Prairie Bridge
(DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION) 106

J. ORDINANCES/SPECIAL RESOLUTIONS/PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1) 2015/1006.10 - Public Hearing - Adopt Resolution No. 1272-2015 Authorizing the
City Manager to make two Supplemental Activity Applications for:
1) Improvements to the access to City Hall and Police Department
(removal of architectural barriers); and 2) an owner occupied
Rehabilitation (OOR) Loan for foundation repairs (ACTION) 108

- 1) 2015/1006.11 - Public Hearing - Introduction and first reading (by title only) of Ordinance No. 338-2015 amending Fence Regulations, Section 17.30.120 of the RDMC to 1) allow ornamental fencing materials such as wrought iron or cyclone fencing no taller than (7) feet in height provided the fence is at least 60% open within the front yard setback; and to prohibit razor or concertina wire fences (**ACTION**) 132

K. REPORTS/STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

1. City Manager
2. Chief of Police
3. Finance Director – **Check Register for August, 2015**
4. Community Development Director

L. COUNCIL REPORTS/COMMUNICATIONS

M. ADJOURNMENT

*The next regular meeting will be on October 20, 2015
at 6:30 p.m. in City Hall Council Chambers*

**RIO DELL CITY COUNCIL
SPECIAL MEETING
SEPTEMBER 22, 2015
MINUTES**

The special meeting of the Rio Dell City Council was called to order at 5:30 p.m. by Mayor Wilson

ROLL CALL: Present: (Closed Session): Mayor Wilson, Councilmembers Johnson, Garnes, Marks and Thompson

Others Present: City Manager Knopp, Water/Roadways Superintendent Jensen and City Attorney Gans

(Regular Meeting): City Manager Knopp, Finance Director Woodcox, Water/Roadways Superintendent Jensen, City Attorney Gans and City Clerk Dunham

Absent: Chief of Police Hill, Community Development Director Caldwell and Wastewater Superintendent Chicora (excused)

CLOSED SESSION

Mayor Wilson announced the Council would be recessing into closed session regarding the following matter:

Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation. Name of Case: City of Rio Dell v. SHN Consulting Engineers and Geologists, Inc., a California Corp. Case No. DR130745

The Council reconvened into open session at 6:30 p.m.

City Attorney Gans announced the Council in closed session reviewed and considered a proposed settlement and lease agreement with respect to pending litigation between the City of Rio Dell and SHN Consulting Engineers and Geologists, Inc. and a resolution was proposed and by a motion from Councilmember Thompson and a second by Councilmember Johnson, the Council did approve the proposed settlement agreement with all members voting in favor. He said the principle terms of the lease and settlement agreement involved SHN agreeing to release and provide to the City at no cost, engineered plans and specifications prepared by them for certain improvements to the existing infiltration gallery at an estimated value of \$50,000. SHN will also pay the City in additional consideration, \$100,000 with those funds to be specifically earmarked for future improvements of the infiltration gallery in exchange for release of the pending litigation. He said copies of the settlement agreement will be available for public review upon request.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Tracy O'Connell reported on upcoming activities and events with the Rio Dell/Scotia Chamber of Commerce and said beginning next week (September 29th) they will be hosting a new program called *Tuesday Night Topics*; the first being *what is happening with the Scotia Gym/Pool?* to take place at the Winema Theater with Ronan Collver, superintendent/principal of the Scotia school as the guest speaker.

She said the next event will be held on October 13th at the Chamber of Commerce office with Mathew Wennerholm, vice president of Aqua Dam followed by *What's Happening with the changes in the Town of Scotia* at the Winema Theater with Frank Bacik as guest speaker.

Also, they are trying to set up free classes from College of the Redwoods on the subjects of *GED prep for the high school equivalency exam; English as a second language; and Workplace Readiness (job search and on-the-job skills)*. She noted that they need to have 15 people sign up for the same time slot in order for it to happen and encouraged citizens to sign up and take advantage of the free classes. She indicated that free child care may be available.

Nick Angeloff, as executive director of *Save the Scotia Gym*, reported things are going extremely well and that they are close to getting the gym open at least to the public and encouraged people to come out and support their efforts by attending the event at the Winema Theater.

He also said he would be remiss to not take advantage of the nice turnout of citizens at the meeting tonight and announce that he is running for a seat on the Harbor District and encouraged everyone to get out and vote.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mayor Wilson removed from the consent calendar, the minutes of September 15, 2015 for separate discussion.

Motion was made by Johnson/Garnes to approve the Consent Calendar including approval of Minutes of the September 1, 2015 regular meeting and to receive the proposed Land Use Matrix and schedule a joint study session with the Planning Commission for the meeting of October 6, 2015 at 5:30 p.m. for review and discussion. Motion carried 5-0.

ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR

Approval of Minutes of the September 15, 2015 Regular Meeting
Mayor Wilson noted the following correction to the minutes on page 3:

Staff explained that the current rate structure is basically what is proposed under Option 2 with the rate at 75% fixed and 25% variable. With this option the base rate would be \$46.63 including 1 unit of water and \$3.04 for each additional unit.

He stated for clarification that under the new proposed rate structure the base rate does not include the first unit of water as with the current rate structure.

He also referred to page 13 of the minutes regarding a statement made by a citizen inferring that the City Manager's salary is over a million dollars a year and stated for clarification that it is \$106,000/year.

Motion was made by Wilson/Garnes to approve the Minutes of the September 15, 2015 regular meeting as corrected. Motion carried 5-0.

SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS/STUDY SESSIONS

Presentation from Redwood Coast Energy Authority (RCEA) on Community Choice Aggregation (CCA) Related to Delivery of Electrical Utilities

City Manager Knopp introduced Matthew Marshall, Executive Director of RCEA who was present to provide a power point presentation on Community Choice Aggregation.

He began by stating that Redwood Coast Energy Authority is currently exploring options for establishing a Community Choice Aggregation program and said what it does is allows public agencies to purchase electricity on behalf of customers instead of relying completely on investor owned utilities (PG&E) to both procure and deliver power. He said the goal of CCA is to gain local control of electricity pricing and energy sources, including potentially requiring a greener mix of energy. PG&E would continue to provide delivery of the electricity over its existing distribution system providing customer metering, billing, collection and all traditional retail customer services but customers would have a choice to purchase electricity from PG&E or the CCA.

He noted that this is a relatively new approach in California although there are around 1,000 CCA's throughout the country. He said Marin Clean Energy (MCE) was launched in 2010 as California's first Community Choice Aggregation program with electricity rate savings of 2.5 to 5%. In 2014 Sonoma Clean Power followed suit and managed to have electricity rates come in at 7% lower across the board than PG&E's rates.

He said on the local level, RCEA and the City of Arcata have been actively looking at forming a CCA and now will be seeking support of the Humboldt County Board of Supervisors to move forward.

He identified the priorities of a CCA as:

- Rate savings to the community
- Use of local renewable energy resources
- Economic Development tool

He pointed out that there are currently two biomass facilities that provide renewable energy sitting idle; Scotia and Blue Lake because they don't have anyone to sell electricity to at a competitive rate. Also, the Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District's hydro net output could equal 50% of the CCA load. He said the caveat to that is that local biomass power is not cheap so the more cities that choose to participate in the CCA and the bigger the customer base, the cheaper the cost.

He explained the next steps are to get the county and cities to approve the JPA modifications; adopt an ordinance; send out RFP's for service providers; and to continue discussion with local agencies; hold community forums and continue with community outreach.

In concluding the presentation he reiterated that the key is that there is potential for pulling out of the CCA when the bids come in for service providers and it is determined that it is not cost effective.

He said he will come back to the Council with the proposed JPA.

Councilmember Johnson asked what the current rate is per kilowatt; what form of generation is Marin and Sonoma using to save; and besides biomass what other form of renewable energy do they foresee utilizing.

Mr. Marshall responded that the current rate per kilowatt varies between a kilowatt range of \$.09 and \$.010 for generation and the cost to run the program. He said Marin basically has a hodge-podge of renewable resources and Sonoma has a portfolio of contracts both short and long term. He noted that both are pursuing adding solar generation to their programs.

He said locally he foresees the use of hydro power, small scale solar, and also wind resources. He noted the biggest resource will be off shore wind and wave resources which is newer technology but could be developed. He said the former pulp mill site is probably the most viable location as far as capacity because there is already good transmission.

Councilmember Garnes asked if entering into the JPA would require any additional staff on the part of the City.

Mr. Marshall said the advantage of the JPA is that the City has no liability or requirement for staffing and said no taxes or local dollars go toward funding its operations because the program is self-supporting.

Mayor Wilson thanked Mr. Marshall and said if the public would like information they should contact RCEA or Councilmember Marks as the City's representative on the RCEA Board.

SPECIAL CALL ITEMS/COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

Adoption of a Water Rate Adjustment Option and Authorizing Staff to begin the Proposition 218 Process

City Manager Knopp provided a brief staff report and said what staff will be presenting this evening is a recap of the information presented at the September 15th Town Hall meeting and provide answers to the questions from the public.

He announced there was one major correction that he needed to clarify regarding the Prop 218 process and said staff had stated at prior meetings that only the owner of record could protest the rate increase however; staff recently clarified that "property ownership" is deemed to include tenants of real property where the tenants are directly liable to pay the water bill.

Finance Director Woodcox stated that ballots will be sent to the record owners of property as well as current rate payers and explained that only one protest vote per parcel can be counted.

Billy Joe Long asked how it will be determined which vote counts and if the property owner's vote takes precedence.

Staff reiterated that only protest votes are counted and there are no "yes" votes.

Thelma Maddox stated that she has 39 residents who live within her mobile home park but because the park is located on a single parcel only one vote is counted.

Mayor Wilson stated that the City Attorney was asked to look at the California Court of Appeals regarding the "owner of record" provision to clarify the intent of the protest provision to be absolutely sure staff was following the legal process.

City Attorney Gans explained that by law any owner or renter that is liable for the bill can protest the increase but only one vote per legal parcel is counted regardless of whether the renter or owner submits the vote.

City Manager Knopp said the recommended action this evening is for the City Council to adopt a rate option and direct staff to proceed with the Prop 218 45-day public noticing process to adjust water rates.

Finance Director Woodcox proceeded with a power point presentation on the *Rio Dell Water Rates and Recap of the Water Rate Study*.

SEPTEMBER 15, 2015 MINUTES
Page 6

She began with a detailed explanation of how to read and understand a typical utility bill pointing out that the proposed increase only applies to the water portion of the bill and not sewer.

She then reviewed a rate chart showing the current rates for usage between 0 and 20 units and the proposed rates under 7 different rate options and what the additional cost would be for each of those options. She noted that average usage is 5 units which is currently \$37.88 and under option 2 which is what staff is proposing will be \$61.83 representing an increase of \$23.95.

Joey Sancho asked for clarification that 1 unit of water is no longer included in the base charge.

Finance Director Woodcox stated that the 1 unit was eliminated as recommended by the City's rate consultant.

Mayor Wilson asked if the proposal is to charge a base fee when no water is used.

Finance Director Woodcox explained that the water must be physically turned off to avoid the base charge so if the ratepayer is simply away and doesn't use any water for a particular month, the base rate still applies.

Councilmember Garnes asked how "off is off" and referred to a neighbor with a guest house.

Finance Director Woodcox explained there are provisions in the water ordinance related to temporary vacation locks when a customer is gone for 30 days or more and the fee is \$10.00 to shut off the water and another \$10.00 to turn it back on when they return. She said if a customer shuts the water off and closes the account, there is no charge other than the sewer standby charge.

She continued with an overview of "How Did We Get Here" going back to the 2005 Water Rate Study and provided a recap of the City's current financial status.

Julie Woodall asked what effect, if any the \$100,000 settlement agreement with SHN Engineers has on the proposed rate structure.

Staff explained that the money is to be set aside for improvements to the infiltration gallery.

City Manager Knopp stated that he cannot underscore enough the seriousness of the condition of the water fund and said since 2014 the City has been receiving communications from potential grant sources expressing concern regarding the financial condition of the water fund regarding multi-year deficits including the Department of Agriculture Rural Development Services and also the State Water Resources Control Board. He noted that this is largely affecting the City's ability to leverage grant funds to help improve the water system over the long term. He said the State of California is issuing a lot of new grant dollars through Prop 1 however; based on the condition of the City's water fund and significant draw-downs of the fund balance, the City is

not eligible to receive loans or grants to improve the aging infrastructure until the situation is corrected.

He continued the discussion with a recap of the August 4, 2015 Council meeting at such time the Council set a series of funding goals for the water system to meet the current debt payments; fund current water department costs into the future; fund new infrastructure including the Metropolitan Well Site; and to set money aside in a Capital Improvement Program to replace infrastructure.

He explained that GHD Engineering put together a CIP for the water system and identified costs between \$400,000 and \$1.4 million annually to accomplish those goals. He said to save ratepayers money, the Council adopted a plan to come up with \$180,000/year over five years in order to have matching funds to leverage state and federal grants to fund several high priority projects for the water system.

He said in moving forward, the Council now needs to adopt a proposed rate structure so staff can proceed with the Prop 218 45-day noticing process.

Staff then provided a review of the various rate structure options ranging from a flat rate across the board to a 100% variable rate based solely on usage. He pointed out that staff's recommendation is to adopt rate option 2 with a 75% fixed and 25% variable rate although any of the seven options are set up to reach the proposed funding goal.

Next was a comparison of current and proposed rates with 15 other cities. Beginning with the lowest to highest, Rio Dell was No. 6 with current rates and No. 12 with proposed rates.

Councilmember Johnson said at the September 15th meeting, Councilmember Thompson made a presentation regarding the Dinsmore Plateau and Monument ratepayers and asked if it is fair to say that staff could essentially do calculations based on potential water connections that would accomplish the goals that Councilmember Thompson expressed.

City Manager Knopp said if he understands what Councilmember Thompson was saying is that any new develop of the Dinsmore Plateau will pay fees to buy in to the system to help pay for not just the infrastructure for the Dinsmore Plateau but infrastructure everywhere including the infiltration gallery and wells which the City has already invested time and money in.

Councilmember Johnson said the idea would be for staff to come up with calculations that would reflect the differences in costs between the customers on Monument and customers within the Dinsmore Plateau and asked staff if that could be done.

City Manager Knopp indicated that it could be done.

Councilmember Thompson said when you get into the Dinsmore zone one of the costs identified in the spreadsheet is \$1,700 for the booster station electricity, and then there is the water main replacement cost of \$10,177 which is the water line on Old Ranch Road that serves 7 rate payers. He said in addition to that \$10,816 is identified for capital improvements.

He referred to the list of customers in the Dinsmore zone and said there are both customers outside and inside city limits paying into this zone and what that means is that all of the 33 customers assigned to the Dinsmore zone are paying for the \$10,177 pipeline serving those 7 rate payers. He asked how the Council can justify having its ratepayers in city limits pay for a pipeline a mile outside City limits.

He added that he spent many hours researching minutes from prior meetings and talked to LAFCo and understands the City is under strict guidelines regarding the formation of a special district but there is the ability for the City to establish a separate area of customers that have rates associated with justifiable costs related to that specific area.

Councilmember Thompson then made a motion that the Monument area out of City limits that includes water users both inside and outside the City's sphere of influence to be named as the *Monument Water Service Area* which corresponds with the May, 2014 recommendation made by himself and Councilmember Johnson to the City Council.

He added that there are too many people that can't agree and that he is totally against any citizen subsidizing those customers for years and especially low income ratepayers. He said they have never accepted responsibility for the system in 1978 and that he was elected to represent the citizens of Rio Dell and is committed to provide to the residents of Rio Dell the most equitable rates possible. He said he doesn't feel the Dinsmore zone is anything that is practical and it is not fair.

Mayor Wilson said one of the things he presented to the Council was the recommendation of the Monument Spring subcommittee and asked if he has something to show the final outcome or formal action of the Council related to the recommendation.

Councilmember Thompson said a resolution was supposed to come back to the Council at the following meeting but it did not happen because of the water shortage emergency.

Mayor Wilson questioned whether a recommendation by the committee constitutes an action by the Council and said he doesn't see the pertinence of bringing a motion to the floor related to a recommended action made in 2014.

City Attorney Gans clarified that the City Council can consider any motion as presented directly related to this agenda item tonight and this in essence is a motion to give staff direction with respect to potential revision related to the Water Rate Study that has already been prepared. He said as to the Mayor's point, it is well taken in that it is historical information only and might

inform Councilmember Thompson's reasoning for making the motion but need not influence any councilmembers determination as they sit here presently on how they seek to proceed. He said the fact that there is this history if you will, and information which perhaps is what has motivated Councilmember Thompson to make the motion, the Council must address the merits of the motion on the floor.

Mayor Wilson called for a second to the motion.

Councilmember Garnes commented that there is a lot of history behind this subject and there is a lot of information that hasn't been explained to this current Council so for her to vote on it tonight would be a dis-service to the citizens of Rio Dell.

Councilmember Thompson said until this issue is resolved he is not prepared to move forward on the rate schedule as proposed.

Councilmember Johnson directed his question to Water Superintendent Jensen and asked if the 3 or 4 customers inside City limits including Bagley, Hall and customers on Redwood Ave., as part of the second pressure zone are served by the newer distribution line.

Water Superintendent Jensen explained there are 2 pressure zones here and clarified that the second pressure zone includes the Dinsmore flat, and Monument Road from the fire hydrant out to the very end of Old Rand Road so Bagley and the customers on Redwood Ave. are on the first pressure zone. He pointed out that it doesn't matter if the services are in or out of City limits; but that they are all on pressure zone 2. He added that all of the lines in the second pressure zone have out lived their useful life and need to be replaced.

Discussion continued regarding potential development of the Dinsmore Plateau and associated costs for infrastructure improvements.

Councilmember Garnes asked for clarification that what are being talked about are future customers that don't exist so basically this is strictly hypothetical.

Mayor Wilson called for a 5 minute recess.

City Attorney Gans said for a point of clarification there is a motion on floor with no second to the motion.

Mayor Wilson acknowledged the status of the motion and recessed the meeting.

The Council reconvened and Councilmember Thompson restated his motion.

The motion died for the lack of a second.

City Manager Knopp drew the Council's attention to the proposed rate structure and provided a brief recap of past actions and next steps in moving forward with rate increase.

Councilmember Thompson noted that on the news yesterday there was an announcement that the Median Household Income (MHI) is 6.7% lower than in 2007 which technically makes the City in compliance with the State's grant requirements.

City Manager Knopp explained that with regard to the MHI there are two issues here. He said the census has incorrectly identified the numbers for Rio Dell and staff is working on the process to correct it; the other point is that correspondence was received from the State that the City is not in compliance because it is not investing properly in its water system. He noted that the recommendation is certainly not to ask citizens to support all of the financial needs of the water system at once but to provide \$180,000/year over a 5-year plan to have matching funds to simply be able to leverage state and federal grants for system improvements.

Mayor Wilson stated that he understands the urgency of the State and that the City is in a vulnerable spot with regard to funding but he thinks the goal is to show the State that the City has a plan for solvency. He asked if there is perhaps a way to implement the rate increase in phases as long as it demonstrates to the State that the requirement is being met but will be done so over time. He suggested starting with phase 1 and at that time to make strong effort to address the MHI issue. He added that it seems very phenomenal that the City's MHI has gone up 50% in this economy. He suggested implementing a phased-in rate increase to take the pressure off from the State and try and solve the MHI issue so perhaps there won't need to be as much of an increase in the future.

City Manager Knopp said the City needs to demonstrate that there is a plan in place but he doesn't know how much of a corrective action plan is required at this time. He said the condition of the water fund is dire and the situation is serious and as such he doesn't know how the State will respond to a phased-in rate structure. He said his belief and hopes however, is that they will try and work with the City.

Mayor Wilson pointed out that when you look at the rate sheet presented on August 4th the items highlighted in yellow are items left out but in all of the options; the debt payments and operations are being addressed.

He proposed that staff take a look at what the State is requiring at minimum then come up with a 2 or 3 step increase.

Councilmember Garnes stated that if the rate increase is phased in it should not be stretched out more than 2 years; with heavy emphasis on the first year. She said while the Council needs to take care of the City, they are also bound to serve the citizens of Rio Dell. She said they are not trying to hurt citizens and pointed out that the Council has to pay the rates as well. She said she wants citizens to understand that they are doing what is necessary to sustain the water system.

SEPTEMBER 22, 2015 MINUTES
Page 11

She said there is a lot more they could talk about such as the drought situation and shifting of pipes in the ground and the fact that rain will not help the drought without snow. She added that the Council is working to find a balance that will work for both sides.

Councilmember Johnson said one way to phase in the rates would be to implement one-half of the increase over the first 2 years and the other half over the next 4 years for a 6-year plan rather than a 5-year plan.

A public hearing was opened to receive public comment on the proposed rate structure.

Tom Joiner pointed out that the current cost of water per gallon is \$.01 per gallon and under proposed option 2 it will be \$.016 per gallon. He said citizens need water and the water system needs to be fixed before it ends up being \$300/month for water. He said in Vallejo where he previously lived, the water was \$160/month and that was many years ago. He commented that people are out of water in some parts of the State and he doesn't want that to happen in Rio Dell.

Dennis Crozier pointed out that with the proposed increase, water rates in Rio Dell will actually be No. 14 on the list of comparisons if only Humboldt County cities are used in the comparison.

Kay Peake stated that she pays 1.5 times the rate and was told it was not enough to cover costs, that there was a huge capital expense to put in the tank but also told that water tank was paid for by a citizen. She said another thing is that she understood that when the tanks were put in part of the program was to replace the Monument water line. She also indicated that under the Haberstock Subdivision Agreement the City was supposed to install 4 water meters instead of 1 which they have never done.

She asked if they will be paying 1.5 the rate for excess usage as well as the base rate.

Staff (Joanne Farley), explained out of city customers are charged 50% more on both the base rate and excess usage.

Kay Peake said she has attended all of the sub-committee meetings with the City Council, the previous City Manager and the City Attorney and when they didn't agree with something they were referred to as "you people" and when they would come back to a meeting with a suggestion were told "that's not part of the discussion." She said Councilmember Thompson seems to have his own agenda but she still doesn't know exactly what that is. She agreed that one group of people should not subsidize another group when costs are higher but no dollar figures have been established; only allegations.

Nick Angeloff said he thought the Council expressed his thoughts very well regarding a phased-in rate increase and said he likes where the Council is going with the proposed rate increase.

SEPTEMBER 22, 2015 MINUTES
Page 12

Judy Ingraham commented that it's not fair to compare Rio Dell with larger cities because Rio Dell doesn't have the businesses that other cities have and pointed out that probably 80% of the residents are low income and can't afford a large increase in their water bill.

Joey Sancho agreed with a phased-in rate increase and suggested perhaps a flat rate increase of \$10.00/month to cover the \$136,000 debt service requirement and allow the City Manager to get the MHI where it should be to be eligible for grants.

An unidentified citizen questioned the budgeted expenditures in the water fund and asked if the Council was provided a breakdown of those costs.

Mayor Wilson stated that the Council was provided a breakdown of all of the fixed costs versus the variable costs and noted that the overall revenue goal shifted slightly from the original \$1.5 million to \$1.1 million.

Councilmember Johnson pointed out that the City's annual budget gives a good breakdown of all revenues and expenditures which is a public document.

Dennis Crozier stated that citizens were asked to conserve water because of the drought which resulted in a reduction in revenue to the City and asked if there is any assurance that the situation isn't going to continue. He also asked if the rates will go down if the drought ends and there is more water in the river.

Finance Director Woodcox commented that there was a 6% reduction in overall water usage over the past year and there is a reduction in revenue attached with that. She said some habits will likely continue with regard to water conservation but it is unknown how it will affect rates down the road.

City Manager Knopp responded that there is no way to guarantee what's going to happen but should the City bring in additional revenue, the City Council will be informed as part of the quarterly financial review.

Mayor Wilson said one of the biggest issues is that the City has an aging water system that has to be addressed and although water usage does have an impact on the revenue what is really needed is money to be able to cover the 20% match to leverage grant funds to do the improvements. He said with regard to accountability, the situation in the past was ignored until there was a crisis. He said this Council's goal is to provide regular updates to the public and would like the citizens to help the Council make good decisions by attending meetings and providing input.

An unidentified citizen commented that she thinks Option 5 with a 100% variable rate at \$12.17 per unit is fair because it holds people accountable for their own usage but questioned whether it would generate enough revenue.

SEPTEMBER 22, 2015 MINUTES
Page 13

City Manager Knopp explained that Richard Culp, the City's rate consultant with RCAC helped to develop the rate structures and according to his calculations, each of the 7 rate options would achieve the overall funding goal. He said staff has concerns about changing to a radical split between fixed and variable charges up front although could perhaps move toward that direction incrementally. He noted that the highest users would see a much higher increase including the City as the largest user which could significantly impact the budget.

Mayor Wilson pointed out that with a 100% variable rate, the revenue is not stable yet the fixed costs don't change.

Karl Crandall commented that he has a family of 5 and sometimes has 7 people in the household which is why he is concerned about the increase.

Kay Peake acknowledged the need for a rate increase but said that she wants to be treated fairly. She asked what prompted the decision for the extra \$65.00 surcharge on the rates for the Dinsmore zone and said she would like to talk about it with Council and staff after the meeting.

Mayor Wilson stated that the City Council has to address the out-of-city water customers and said when the City took over the water system it accepted the obligation to provide water to those customers and whether that was well thought out or not is questionable. He said the issue of the Old Ranch Road water line has gone on too long and has to be resolved but the Council needs to know all the facts.

Motion was made by Johnson/Marks to adopt rate option 2 phased-in with 50% of the value of the increase over the first 2 years and then 4 years at 100% and to direct staff to proceed with the Prop 218 process requiring a 45-day noticing period and scheduling of the public hearing. Also, to direct staff to begin the review of water connection charges for both inside and outside City customers.

The intent of the motion was that the new rates be phased in over 2 increases. The first increase would occur with the bill going out on or around January 1, 2016 (for December 2015 usage) and would increase the rates 50% of the proposed increase under option 2. In 2 years, January 1, 2018 the rates would increase to the full 100% of the new rate schedule. Essentially this would take the original proposed 5-year plan to a 6-year plan to fully fund the water system improvements as identified.

Councilmember Garnes asked if the Council moves forward with this option if there will be room for discussion regarding the equity of the Dinsmore zone surcharge.

City Manager Knopp stated that he would be happy to talk with Kay Peake after the meeting to help explain how the breakdown on that zone is and said the recommendation of the rate consultant was to ignore the arbitrary city boundary issue and the 150% rate and base the rates strictly on how the system is composed which is by pressure zone. He said he believes the rates are very defensible legally and also from an ethical and good neighbor standpoint that this

change is appropriate and also a step in the right direction for harmony between everyone involved.

Mayor Wilson said with this rate proposal, and as staff moves forward and investigates and finds other solutions, questioned the ability to adjust the numbers in the cost analysis on an annual basis as the numbers may change.

City Manager Knopp stated that it may be more of a legal question but said it would have to specify to the public in the 218 materials exactly what the City is going to do so it will have to be spelled out as Councilmember Johnson explained unless there is some way to re-word the notice to allow for additional adjustments, staff would have to come back to Council and begin another Prop 218 process to change the rates.

City Attorney Gans stated for clarification that the law gives the City Council the ability to lower rates at any time without going through the Prop 218 process but requires the Prop 218 process to be followed when increasing rates. He said the City Council can always re-evaluate the rate structure if they think it's no longer reflecting actual costs of providing the service. He said one other important point is if the Council were to approve Councilmember Johnson's motion, the direction should also be to direct staff to consult with the rate consultant to make sure the revised rate structure is Prop 218 compliant in terms of providing the service. He said practically speaking, he can't think of any reason for it not to be compliant because in essence it will be going in a bit less than the true cost to provide the service and incrementally capturing it over time. He said this is something the rate consultant should access. He added that the City Manager is correct in that the rate cost analysis has to be complete at the time the Prop 218 noticing process begins.

Mayor Wilson said with the Water Infiltration Gallery decision there is potentially some money to offset some of the costs and if he understands it, the beginning costs were estimated in excess of a million dollars and now somewhere below that so the numbers should be adjusted accordingly. Also, he asked for clarification on Councilmember Johnson's motion that one-half of the rate increase would be implemented during the first 2 years and the other half over 4 years for a total of 6 years. He also asked how this rate structure will reflect on the State's requirement to meet 1.5% of the MHI.

Councilmember Johnson said he was correct and that it would capture 100% of the proposed revenue over 6 years rather than 5 years.

Councilmember Thompson said it sounds like there are several changes being proposed and suggested staff put together some firm numbers and before beginning the Prop 218 process with noticing the public, perhaps have Richard Culp look at the proposed rate structure then bring it back to the Council for final approval.

City Manager Knopp said he believes the Council has potentially achieved the ceiling here and as such, staff would ask for some flexibility. He said certainly the numbers could come down in the areas of the infiltration gallery but staff also has some work to do to double check and make sure everything is correct before engaging in the 45-day noticing period and asked the Council to allow some flexibility to carry out that process. He noted that staff will obviously not exceed that ceiling and will work within the perimeters the Council has set and do its best to make it as efficient and tight a package before going out to the public as possible.

He said staff will come back to the Council on October 6, 2015 with the revised rate schedule and draft public notice to begin the Prop 218 process. He noted that this may push the noticing period to the end of November.

Councilmember Garnes asked when the new rates are projected to go into effect.

City Manager Knopp indicated the earliest the rates could go into effect would be the December billing but more realistically the January billing.

Mayor Wilson called for public comment as to the pending motion.

Melissa Marks asked if the annual 3% increase for inflation is still in effect; staff responded that the 3% increase on July 1st of each year will continue.

Motion then carried 5-0.

REPORTS/STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

Finance Director Woodcox reported on recent activities in the finance department and said they have been very busy and will be providing information to the auditor to begin the FY 2014-2015 audit process.

COUNCIL REPORTS/COMMUNICATIONS

Councilmember Johnson requested an item be placed on the October 6, 2015 agenda regarding a request originated with HCAOG and explained they have some money and want to do a survey regarding the best way to get money for streets and roads. He said all of the HCAOG representatives are going back to their respective boards and talking about whether they want a survey, want to put \$30,000 into lobbying efforts, forget about it, or put the \$30,000 somewhere else.

Councilmember Thompson provided a brief update on HWMA and the final capping of the Cumming landfill. He said the 3-year project cost \$13.2 million of which the State held 20% pending completion of the project. He said they were successful in paying the bills but will feel a lot better finally getting the \$2 million back into HWMA's hands.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion was made by Johnson/Marks to adjourn the meeting at 9:15 p.m. to the October 6, 2015 regular meeting. Motion carried 5-0.

Frank Wilson, Mayor

Attest:

Karen Dunham, City Clerk

675 Wildwood Avenue
Rio Dell, CA 95562
(707) 764-3532
(707) 764-5480 (fax)



**CITY OF RIO DELL
STAFF REPORT
CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
October 6, 2015**

TO: Mayor and Members of the City Council
THROUGH: Kyle Knopp, City Manager *[Signature]*
FROM: Brooke Woodcox, Finance Director *[Signature]*
DATE: October 6, 2015
SUBJECT: Authorize Finance Director to sign and submit Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) claim for Fiscal Year 2014-2015

RECOMMENDATIONS

Authorize Finance Director to sign and submit the City's annual Regional Surface Transportation Program claim for RSTP revenues distributed annually by Humboldt County Association of Governments (HCAOG).

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

RSTP funds come from the federal excise tax on gasoline and are distributed each year throughout the County by HCAOG. The funds can be used to support various transportation projects. According to HCAOG, the majority of RSTP funds that go to the County and local districts are applied towards road budgets.

ATTACHMENTS

- 1.1 FY 2014-2015 Annual Project List
- 1.2 Statement of Compliance with Exchange Agreement
- 1.3 FY 2013-2014 Annual Report
- 1.4 HCAOG RSTP Policy and Allocation

HUMBOLDT COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (RSTP)

Section 182.6(d)(1)

Annual Project List – Fiscal Year 2014-15

(List all Potential Projects)

| <u>Street/Road</u> | <u>Type of Project Functional Classification</u> | <u>Est. Amount</u> |
|--------------------|--|--------------------|
| CITY WIDE | STREETS - MAINTENANCE | \$22,512 |

Authorized Signature

Date

BROOKE WOODCOX, FINANCE DIRECTOR

Printed Name & Title

CITY OF RIO DELL

Agency

HUMBOLDT COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (RSTP)
Section 182.6(d)(1)

**Statement of Compliance
with Exchange Agreement**

Pursuant to the Regional Surface Transportation Program Section 182.6(d)(1) program, the undersigned claimant hereby acknowledges that he/she has received a copy of the Exchange Agreement dated **April 22, 2015** between HCAOG and the State Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and agency agrees to comply with the applicable required conditions contained therein.

Undersigned claimant also acknowledges that jurisdictions receiving State RSTP funds have complied with Section 1220.4(6) *A special fund for the purpose of depositing exchange funds has been established within a jurisdiction's special gas tax street improvement fund or county road fund.*

Authorized Signature

Date

BROOKE WOODCOX, FINANCE DIRECTOR
Printed Name and Title

HUMBOLDT COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (RSTP)

Section 182.6(d)(1)

Annual Report

Reporting Period: **Fiscal Year ending 2013-14**

Amount Received \$ 21,592

Briefly describe how the RSTP funds were expended by your agency during the previous fiscal year. If expenditures do not match the previously submitted project list, please provide a written explanation.

CITYWIDE STREET MAINTENANCE

If your agency is "saving" the RSTP funds for a larger project that cannot be funded in a single year, please indicate below. If funds are being carried over for any other reason, please explain.

1. RSTP d(1) funds were expended on the following project(s):

| <u>Street/Road</u> | <u>Type of Project Functional Classification</u> | <u>Amount</u> |
|--------------------|--|---------------|
| CITYWIDE | STREET MAINTENANCE | 21,592 |

2. RSTP d(1) funds are being carried over as described below:

| | | |
|------------------------|------|---|
| <hr/> | | <u>BROOKE WOODCOX, FINANCE DIRECTOR</u> |
| Authorized Signature | Date | Printed Name & Title |
| <u>CITY OF RIO DEL</u> | | |
| Agency | | |



HCAOG

*Regional Transportation
Planning Agency*

611 I Street, Suite B
Eureka, CA 95501
707.444.8208
Fax: 707.444.8319
www.hcaog.net

September 18, 2015

Kyle Knopp, City Manager
City of Rio Dell
675 Wildwood Avenue
Rio Dell, California 95526

Dear Kyle Knopp:

The Humboldt County Association of Governments (HCAOG) Board approved the attached Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Policy and Allocation at their meeting of September 17, 2015.

Prior to the annual distribution of funds, an RSTP Exchange Agreement is executed between HCAOG and the State Department of Transportation (Caltrans). This exchange of RSTP funds for State funds eliminates the administrative burden of some federal requirements for use of the funds. A copy of the Agreement detailing requirements for RSTP fund recipients is enclosed.

RSTP funds will be distributed to eligible recipients when the funds become available and upon the return of the three signed forms provided in the Policy.

Please feel free to contact Debbie Egger at 444-8208 or debbie.egger@hcaog.net if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

for 
Marcella Clem
Executive Director

Encl: (1) FY 14-15 RSTP Policy and Allocation
(2) FY 14-15 RSTP Agreement No. X15-6133(044)

Electronic cc: Brooke Woodcox
Jesse Willor

FY 2014-15

Regional Surface Transportation Program

Policy and Allocation



September 2015

Humboldt County Association of Governments
611 I Street, Suite B
Eureka, CA 95501
Phone: 707.444.8208
www.hcaog.net

Background

The Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) was established by California State Statute utilizing Surface Transportation Program Funds that are identified in Section 133 of Title 23 of the United States Code. California Streets and Highways Code Section 182.6(d) was enacted under federal transportation bills, beginning in 1991 with the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) legislation, subsequently under the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) and the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU).

The Federal Aid Urban (FAU) and Federal Aid Secondary (FAS) regulations implemented through Section 182.6(d) were repealed by the federal government through the passage of Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21). However, the FAU/FAS regulations currently remain in State law.

RSTP funds originate from the federal excise tax on gasoline. The State of California distributes the funds to regional agencies and counties based on population. As a rural agency, HCAOG is allowed to participate in an exchange of these federal funds to nonfederal State Highway Account funds. Prior to an annual distribution of funds, an Exchange Agreement is executed between HCAOG and the State Department of Transportation (CALTRANS). This exchange allows for greater flexibility with fewer administrative burdens. The County of Humboldt receives RSTP funds through a separate Exchange Agreement.

RSTP funds support a broad range of transportation projects. In the Humboldt region, most are used to augment city and county road budgets. Beginning with the 2007-08 RSTP cycle, HCAOG began setting aside funds for tribal governments. The County of Humboldt has agreed to administer the funds for a single project.

Exchange funds are subject to financial and compliance audits by State of California auditors.

Eligible Projects

The exchange of funds requires agreement to projects defined under Title 23-Section 133 of the Federal Aid for Highway and in accordance with the State of California Constitution. Section 133(b) provides for the following eligible projects:

- (1) Construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration, and operational improvements for highways (including Interstate highways) and bridges (including bridges on public roads of all functional classifications), including any such construction or reconstruction necessary to accommodate other transportation modes, and including the seismic retrofit and painting of and application of calcium magnesium acetate, sodium acetate/formate, or other environmentally acceptable, minimally corrosive anti-icing and de-icing compositions on bridges and approaches thereto and other elevated structures, mitigation of damage to wildlife, habitat, and ecosystems caused by a transportation project funded under this title.

- (2) Capital costs for transit projects eligible for assistance under chapter 53 of title 49, including vehicles and facilities, whether publicly or privately owned, that are used to provide intercity passenger service by bus.

(3) Carpool projects, fringe and corridor parking facilities and programs, bicycle transportation and pedestrian walkways in accordance with section 217, and the modification of public sidewalks to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.).

(4) Highway and transit safety infrastructure improvements and programs, hazard eliminations, projects to mitigate hazards caused by wildlife and railway-highway grade crossings.

(5) Highway and transit research and development and technology transfer programs.

(6) Capital and operating costs for traffic monitoring, management, and control facilities and programs, including advanced truck stop electrification systems.

(7) Surface transportation planning programs.

(8) Transportation enhancement activities.

(9) Transportation control measures listed in section 108 (f)(1)(A) (other than clause (xvi)) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7408 (f)(1)(A)).

(10) Development and establishment of management systems under Section 303.

(11) In accordance with all applicable Federal law and regulations, participation in natural habitat and wetlands mitigation efforts related to projects funded under this title, which may include participation in natural habitat and wetlands mitigation banks; contributions to statewide and regional efforts to conserve, restore, enhance, and create natural habitats and wetlands; and development of statewide and regional natural habitat and wetlands conservation and mitigation plans, including any such banks, efforts, and plans authorized pursuant to the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (including crediting provisions). Contributions to such mitigation efforts may take place concurrent with or in advance of project construction. Contributions toward these efforts may occur in advance of project construction only if such efforts are consistent with all applicable requirements of Federal law and regulations and State transportation planning processes. With respect to participation in a natural habitat or wetland mitigation effort related to a project funded under this title that has an impact that occurs within the service area of a mitigation bank, preference shall be given, to the maximum extent practicable, to the use of the mitigation bank if the bank contains sufficient available credits to offset the impact and the bank is approved in accordance with the Federal Guidance for the Establishment, Use and Operation of Mitigation Banks (60 Fed. Reg. 58605 (November 28, 1995)) or other applicable Federal law (including regulations).

(12) Projects relating to intersections that—

(A) have disproportionately high accident rates;

(B) have high levels of congestion, as evidenced by—

(i) interrupted traffic flow at the intersection; and

(ii) a level of service rating that is not better than "F" during peak travel hours, calculated in accordance with the Highway Capacity Manual issued by the Transportation Research Board; and

(C) are located on a Federal-aid highway.

(13) Infrastructure-based intelligent transportation systems capital improvements.

(14) Environmental restoration and pollution abatement in accordance with Section 328.

(15) Control of noxious weeds and aquatic noxious weeds and establishment of native species in accordance with section 329.

Agreement with jurisdictions

The following administrative requirements are hereby implemented to assure that the agencies receiving the RSTP funds are using the funds properly, and to assure that HCAOG is properly tracking the funds.

1. Project Lists. Each entity shall be required to submit to HCAOG a list of eligible projects on which they expect to expend the funds, prior to funds being distributed by HCAOG. The list shall include the name of all streets and roads with potential projects, the type of project (*rehabilitation, maintenance, etc.*) and the functional classification based on the "annual maintained mileage report" prepared by each agency. (Form is attached)
2. Exchange Agreement Compliance. HCAOG is required to sign an annual Exchange Agreement with the State which states that HCAOG (and project sponsors) agree to comply with required conditions. Therefore, each entity shall receive a copy of the agreement and be required to sign a statement of compliance in order to receive funds. Compliance includes a requirement that a special fund for the purpose of depositing exchange funds has been established within a jurisdiction's special gas tax street improvement funds or county road fund. (Form is attached)
3. Annual Report. Each entity shall be required to submit an annual report before receiving new RSTP funds each annual cycle. The report shall indicate how funds were expended or explain if funds are being carried over for a larger project. (Note: The annual report should agree with the project list submitted, otherwise a written explanation will be required). (Form is attached)

RSTP Formula Distribution

During a normal funding cycle, HCAOG receives instructions from the State to begin the process to exchange the RSTP funds sometime during the calendar year, resulting in an executed Exchange Agreement and receipt of funds by or near June 30 of each fiscal year. HCAOG staff then prepares a draft RSTP Program for stakeholder and public review and discussion at HCAOG Technical Advisory Committee and Board meetings. Upon HCAOG Board approval, HCAOG notifies eligible claimants of the amount of available funding per the formula distribution. Funds are then distributed to the County and Cities upon compliance with the Agreement with Jurisdictions, as explained above.

**Humboldt County Association of Governments
Regional Surface Transportation Program FY 2014-15**

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| Total Available to Region | \$1,154,886 |
| Regional Apportionment | - \$262,188 |
| Excess Fund Apportionment | \$892,698 |

The **Regional Apportionment** is apportioned to the four former Federal Aid Urban FAU recipients in 1990 era urbanized proportions. The amount of \$262,188 has remained constant in this formula of distribution.

Historically, McKinleyville's share (15%) is taken off the top, along with the \$100,000 transit-set-aside for the County. The transit-set-aside is a payment to the County for allocating \$200,000 of their Local Transportation Fund to the Humboldt Transit Authority for bus procurement. The resulting percentages to the three other areas were then calculated on 85% of the remaining funds to account for the 15% allocated off the top for McKinleyville.

For clarity, the \$100,000 transit set-aside is the only item taken off of the top. The remaining amount (\$162,188) is then apportioned to the four FAU areas based on the following percentages set in the 1990's.

23.8% Arcata 46.6% Eureka 14.6% Fortuna 15.0% McKinleyville

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Regional Apportionment | 262,188 |
| Transit Set Aside (County of Humboldt) | (100,000) |
| Balance | \$162,188 |

| | |
|--|------------------|
| McKinleyville (County of Humboldt) (15%) | 24,328 |
| City of Arcata (23.8%) | 38,601 |
| City of Eureka (46.6%) | 75,580 |
| City of Fortuna (14.6%) | 23,679 |
| Total | \$162,188 |

The **Excess Fund Apportionment** is allocated to the former FAU recipients and the FAS recipient (Humboldt County) after funds for the Small Agency Program are deducted. The historical FAU/FAS ratio is as follows:

FAU 32.8% (Arcata, Eureka, Fortuna and McKinleyville)
FAS 67.2% (County of Humboldt)

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Excess Fund Apportionment | 892,698 |
| Small Agency Program (8.9%) | 79,450 |
| Remainder to FAU/FAS | 813,248 |

| Entity | % of FAS 67.2% of \$813,248 | % of FAU 32.8% of \$813,248 | Allocation |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|
| County of Humboldt | 100 | n/a | 546,503 |
| Arcata | n/a | 23.8 | 63,485 |
| Eureka | n/a | 46.6 | 124,303 |
| Fortuna | n/a | 14.6 | 38,945 |
| McKinleyville | n/a | 15 | 40,012 |
| Total | 100% | 100% | \$813,248 |

| Small Agency Program based on 8.9% of the Excess Fund Apportionment | | | | |
|---|----------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Jurisdictions | Population Estimates | % of Small Program population | % of Small Agency Program | Allocation |
| Blue Lake | 1,260 | 0.9% | 10.6% | 8,434 |
| Ferndale | 1,369 | 1.0% | 11.5% | 9,164 |
| Rio Dell | 3,372 | 2.4% | 28.4% | 22,572 |
| Trinidad | 363 | 0.3% | 3.1% | 2,430 |
| Tribal Areas | 5,505 | 3.9% | 46.4% | 36,850 |
| Total | 11,869 | 8.9% | 100% | \$79,450 |

City population data from Table E-1, California Department of Finance

| Population data for tribal areas | |
|--|--------------|
| Bear River Band of the Rohnerville Rancheria | 141 |
| Blue Lake Rancheria | 203 |
| Cher-Ae Heights Indian Community | 106 |
| Hoopa Valley Tribe | 2,748 |
| Karuk Tribe | 1,069 |
| Yurok Tribe | 1,236 |
| Total | 5,505 |

Population data provided from the Humboldt County Tribal Transportation Commission

Summary of Apportionments

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| County of Humboldt (100,000+24,328+546,503+40,012)) | 710,843 |
| Arcata (38,601+63,485) | 102,086 |
| Blue Lake | 8,434 |
| Eureka (75,580+124,303) | 199,883 |
| Ferndale | 9,164 |
| Fortuna (23,679+38,945) | 62,624 |
| Rio Dell | 22,572 |
| Trinidad | 2,430 |
| Tribal Governments | 36,850 |
| Total | \$1,154,886 |

FEDERAL APPORTIONMENT EXCHANGE PROGRAM
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY

District: 01

Agency: Humboldt County Association of Governments

Agreement No. X15-6133(044)

AMS Adv ID:0115000081

THIS AGREEMENT is made on May 12, 2015 by Humboldt County Association of Governments, a Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) designated under Section 29532 of the California Government Code, and the State of California, acting by and through the Department of Transportation (STATE).

WHEREAS, RTPA desires to assign RTPA's portion of apportionments made available to STATE for allocation to transportation projects under "Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act" (MAP-21), as modified in accordance with Section 182.6 of the Streets and Highways Code (Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds) in exchange for nonfederal State Highway Account funds:

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties agree as follows:

1. As authorized by Section 182.6(g) of the Streets and Highways Code, RTPA agrees to assign to STATE the following portion of its estimated annual RSTP apportionment:

\$1,154,886.00 for Fiscal Year 2014/2015

The above referenced portion of RTPA's estimated annual RSTP apportionment is equal to the estimated total RSTP apportionment less (a) the estimated minimum annual RSTP apportionment set for the County under Section 182.6(d)(2) of the Streets and Highways Code, (b) any Federal apportionments already obligated for projects not chargeable to said County's annual RSTP minimum apportionment, and (c) those RSTP apportionments RTPA has chosen to retain for future obligation.

2. RTPA agrees the exchange for County's estimated annual RSTP minimum apportionment under Section 182.6(d)(2) of the Streets and Highways Code will be paid by STATE directly to Humboldt County.

For Caltrans Use Only

I hereby Certify upon my own personal knowledge that budgeted funds are available for this encumbrance



Accounting Officer

| Date 4/15/15 | \$ 1,154,886.00

3. Subject to the availability of STATE funds following the receipt of an RTPA invoice evidencing RTPA's assignment of those estimated RSTP funds under Section 1 to STATE, STATE agrees to pay to RTPA an amount not to exceed \$1,154,886.00 of non-federal exchange funds ("Funds") that equals the sum of the estimated RSTP apportionment assigned to State in Section 1 above.

4. RTPA agrees to allocate all of these Funds only for those projects implemented by cities, counties, and other agencies as are authorized under Article XIX of the California State Constitution, in accordance with the requirements of Section 182.6(d)(1) of the Streets and Highways Code.

5. RTPA agrees to provide to STATE annually by each August 1 a list of all local project sponsors allocated Funds in the preceding fiscal year and the amounts allocated to each sponsor.

6. RTPA agrees to require project sponsors receiving those Funds provided under this AGREEMENT to establish a special account for the purpose of depositing therein all payments received from RTPA pursuant to this Agreement: (a) for cities within their Special Gas Tax Street Improvement Fund, (b) for counties, within their County Road Fund, and (c) for all other sponsors, a separate account.

7. RTPA agrees, in the event a project sponsor fails to use Funds received hereunder in accordance with the terms of this AGREEMENT, to require that project sponsor to return those exchange Funds to RTPA for credit to the account established under Section 6 above. In the event of any such requirement by STATE, RTPA shall provide written verification to STATE that the requested corrective action has been taken.

8. STATE reserves the right to reduce the STATE Funds payment required hereunder to offset such additional obligations by the RTPA or any of its sponsoring agencies against any RSTP federal apportionments as are chargeable to, but not included in, the assignment made under Section 1 above.

9. COST PRINCIPLES

A) RTPA agrees to comply with, and require all project sponsors to comply with Office of Management and Budget Supercircular 2 CFR 200, Cost Principles for State and Local Government and the Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments.

B) RTPA will assure that its fund recipients will be obligated to agree that (A) Contract Cost Principles and Procedures, 48 CFR, Federal Acquisition Regulations System, Chapter 1, Part 31, Et Seq., shall be used to determine the allowability of individual project cost items and (B) Those parties shall comply with Federal Administrative Procedures in accordance with 2 CFR 200, Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements To State And Local Governments. Every sub-recipient receiving funds as a contractor or sub-contractor under this agreement shall comply with Federal administrative procedures in accordance with 2 CFR 200, Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments.

C) Any fund expenditures for costs for which RTPA has received payment or credit that are determined by subsequent audit to be unallowable under Office of Management and Budget Supercircular 2 CFR 200 are subject to repayment by RTPA to STATE. Should RTPA fail to reimburse fund moneys due STATE within 30 days of demand, or within such other period as may be agreed in writing between the parties, hereto, STATE is authorized to intercept and withhold future payments due RTPA and STATE or any third-party source, including but not limited to, the State Treasurer, The State Controller and the CTC. The implementation of the Supercircular will cancel 49 Cfr Part 18.

10. THIRD PARTY CONTRACTING

A) RTPA shall not award a construction contract over \$10,000 or other contracts over \$25,000 [excluding professional service contracts of the type which are required to be procured in accordance with Government Code Sections 4525 (d), (e) and (f)] on the basis of a noncompetitive negotiation for work to be performed using Funds without the prior written approval of STATE.

B) Any subcontract or agreement entered into by RTPA as a result of disbursing Funds received pursuant to this AGREEMENT shall contain all of the fiscal provisions of this Agreement; and shall mandate that travel and per diem reimbursements and third-party contract reimbursements to subcontractors will be allowable as project costs only after those costs are incurred and paid for by the subcontractors.

C) In addition to the above, the preaward requirements of third party contractor/consultants with RTPA should be consistent with Local Program Procedures as published by STATE.

11. ACCOUNTING SYSTEM

RTPA, its contractors and subcontractors shall establish and maintain an accounting system and records that properly accumulate and segregate Fund expenditures by line item. The accounting system of RTPA, its contractors and all subcontractors shall conform to Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP), enable the determination of incurred costs at interim points of completion, and provide support for reimbursement payment vouchers or invoices.

12. RIGHT TO AUDIT

For the purpose of determining compliance with this AGREEMENT and other matters connected with the performance of RTPA's contracts with third parties, RTPA, RTPA's contractors and subcontractors and STATE shall each maintain and make available for inspection all books, documents, papers, accounting records, and other evidence pertaining to the performance of such contracts, including, but not limited to, the costs of administering those various contracts. All of the above referenced parties shall make such materials available at their respective offices at all reasonable times for three years from the date of final payment of Funds to RTPA. STATE, the California State Auditor, or any duly authorized representative of STATE or the United States Department of Transportation, shall each have access to any books, records, and documents that are pertinent for audits, examinations, excerpts, and transactions, and RTPA shall furnish copies thereof if requested.


13. TRAVEL AND SUBSISTENCE


Payments to only RTPA for travel and subsistence expenses of RTPA forces and its subcontractors claimed for reimbursement or applied as local match credit shall not exceed rates authorized to be paid exempt non-represented State employees under current State Department of Personnel Administration (DPA) rules.

If the rates invoiced are in excess of those authorized DPA rates, then RTPA is responsible for the cost difference and any overpayments shall be reimbursed to STATE on demand.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Department of Transportation

Humboldt County Association of Governments

By: 
Office of Project Implementation
Division of Local Assistance
Date: May 12, 2015


By: 
Title: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Date: 5-6-15

*Rio Dell City Hall
675 Wildwood Avenue
Rio Dell, CA 95562
(707) 764-3532
riodellcity.com*



October 6, 2015

TO: Rio Dell City Council

FROM: Kyle Knopp, City Manager 

SUBJECT: Adoption of Resolution 1273-2015 Amending the City of Rio Dell Employee Handbook.

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE CITY COUNCIL:

Adopt Resolution 1273-2015 amending the employee handbook.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

From time to time, the Rio Dell Employee Handbook requires updating. Two pressing issues are at hand.

The State of California has enacted the Healthy Workplaces, Healthy Families Act of 2014 (AB1522). Beginning on July 1, 2015 employers must provide paid sick leave for employees covered under AB 1522. Under the provisions of AB 1522, the City may establish the earning method for paid sick leave. Under the proposed change to Section 5.15 of the handbook, eligible hourly employees will be credited ("frontloaded") with 24 hours of sick leave after 30 calendar days of employment, and will receive 24 hours of sick leave on July 1st of each fiscal year thereafter. Unused sick leave does not carry over into the next fiscal year. Paid sick leave would then be allowed to be used (after 90 days) in the manner it is currently allowed to be used for all other employees. From July 1, 2015 to today, the City of Rio Dell has had no part-time employees. However, it is possible the City may hire part time employees in the near future. This amendment complies with the requirements of AB 1522.

As an alternative, the City could use an accrual method at one hour of sick leave accrued per every 30 hours worked with a cap of 48 hours. This is not recommended.

The attached resolution also authorized changes to Section 3.24 of the handbook pertaining to nepotism.

///

RESOLUTION NO. 1273-2015

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RIO DELL ADOPTING
AMENDMENTS TO THE EMPLOYEE HANDBOOK**

WHEREAS, the Employee Handbook is used as a fair and equitable rule book for personnel management in municipal government, and

WHEREAS, the intent of the Employee Handbook is to provide clear guidance to employees and management, and

WHEREAS, the Employee Handbook was approved by the Rio Dell City Council on July 10, 2012 via Resolution 1065-2012 and further amended on January 3, 2013 via Resolution 1185-2013, and

WHEREAS, rules in the handbook have need for amendment from time to time.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Council of the City of Rio Dell does hereby adopt amendments to the City of Rio Dell Employee Handbook attached hereto as "Attachment A" to the City Council staff report of this same date,

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Rio Dell on October 6, 2015 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Frank Wilson, Mayor

ATTEST:

I, Karen Dunham, City Clerk for the City of Rio Dell, State of California, hereby certify the above to be a full, true and correct copy of Resolution No. 1273 -2015 adopted by the City Council of the City of Rio Dell on October 6, 2015.

Karen Dunham, City Clerk

ATTACHMENT "A"

AMENDMENTS TO EMPLOYEE HANDBOOK

10-6-2015

- 1.) Section 3.24 – Add "in-law" to the definitions of relationships.

Definitions of Relationships:

*Relative - An employee's parent, step-parent, spouse, domestic partner, significant other, child (native, adopted or step), sibling, **immediate family in-law** or grandparent.*

- 2.) Section 5.15 – Amend to comply with State law.

*Sick leave with pay shall be granted by the City at a rate of 3.69 hours per payroll period **for full-time employees**. Payroll is every two weeks. ~~Temporary or intermittent employees or employees who work part-time shall not be entitled to sick leave.~~*


Temporary or intermittent employees or employees who work part-time shall receive twenty-four (24) hours of paid sick leave after thirty (30) calendar days of employment with the City. No unused sick leave accrual shall be carried over to the following fiscal year for temporary, intermittent or part-time employees. Temporary, intermittent or part-time employees will only be able to utilize this sick leave until they have been employed for 90 days. All other policies and procedures regarding use of sick leave shall apply to temporary, intermittent or part-time employees.

675 Wildwood Avenue
Rio Dell, CA 95562
(707) 764-3532
(707) 764-5480 (fax)
E-mail: cm@riodellcity.com



October 6, 2015

TO: City Council

FROM: Kyle Knopp, City Manager 

DATE: October 6, 2015

SUBJECT: **Adoption of Resolution 1271-2015 Pertaining to Proposition 218 Protest Vote Process with Further Direction to Staff to Schedule a Public Hearing Following a 45-day Public Noticing Period to Adjust Water Rates**

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the City Council direct staff to proceed with the 218 process, adopting Resolution 1271-2015 and directing staff to schedule a Public Hearing for December 1, 2015 and send Notice of a Public Hearing and protest vote instructions as required by law.

Other options include but are not limited to modifying the proposal back to staff's original recommendation.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

On September 22, 2015 the City Council selected a proposed rate schedule with a ratio of 75% fixed charges and 25% variable charges to achieve an overall revenue goal of approximately \$1.1 million annually for the water fund. The proposal largely matched staff's recommendations but differed in the implementation timeline. The Council's motion called for implementing only 50% of the rate increase, and holding that level steady for two years before finally implementing the full recommended increase level on year three. This would ostensibly turn staff's recommended 5-year capital plan into a 6-year plan.

Implementing a plan that applies 50% of the new rate creates several potential issues. The Current MHI figure the City would need to achieve on its average bill is \$52.66 while the 50% billing level directed by council would only achieve a level of \$49.95 in year one and \$51.18 in year two (due to inflation adjustment). While a downward adjustment in the MHI figure is possible, it is not guaranteed. This adds risk to the overall proposal to seek grant funds.

Second, the 50% increase poses problems in building capital replacement funds. The rate increase was established to cover, in order of precedence: (1) mandatory debt service; (2) correcting the operating deficit; (3) rebuilding reserves; (4) funding the operation of the

Metropolitan Well Site; and then finally (5) funding a “priority CIP project 5-year reserve.” Unless the council directs that the order of precedence be changed (which is not recommended), the total amount of dollars built up in the initial 2-year phase-in for the capital reserve build will be approximately \$0.00 if the Dinsmore Zone capital reserves are excluded. Therefore, a 6-year capital plan is actually a 7-year plan due to the two-year phase-in.

In order for the water rates to meet the base current MHI, the increase would need to be 58% which would also place \$50,000 annually towards the CIP.

The following chart depicts water user fees for year one of the phased-in rates:

| FEE TYPE | CURRENT RATES | | YEAR 1 RATES |
|---------------------------------|---------------|----------|--------------|
| | In City | Out City | All Zones |
| Base Rate IN City | 27.84 | 41.79 | 37.65 |
| Base Rate OUT City | | | 37.65 |
| Unit 1 | - | - | 2.46 |
| Units 2-9 | 2.51 | 3.78 | 2.46 |
| Units 10+ | 3.78 | 5.67 | 2.46 |
| Additional Dinsmore Zone Charge | | | 32.61 |

The Proposition 218 process to adjust water fees and charges has been communicated to Council and the public beginning August 4, 2015, and again on August 18. A special public hearing was also held on September 15, and again on September 22. A process of transparency has been the intent, and staff and the Council has followed through on many levels to attain this.

The Proposition 218 process requires that a legal notice be sent by mail to all property owners and rate payers. The notice must include information about the proposed new rates and instructions for property owners and rate payers to make a protest. Property owners and rate payers are allowed a minimum of 45 days to protest the new rates from the time of the mailing. A public hearing will be scheduled for the next regular council meeting after the passage of 45 days from the time that the notices are sent out. If the City receives over 50% of parcels registering a protest vote, the increased rates cannot be implemented. A draft copy of the notice is attached.

Attached is Resolution 1271-2015 which provides guidance in how the protest vote process will be handled. It remains largely unchanged from prior procedures associated with the Sewer rate change. Property owners and rate payers may vote, however only one vote per parcel will be counted. The public hearing to receive comments from property owners of record is set for December 1, 2015 at 6:30 p.m. in the City of Rio Dell Council Chambers, 675 Wildwood Ave., Rio Dell, California.



RESOLUTION 1271-2015

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RIO DELL ESTABLISHING PROCEDURES FOR THE CONDUCT OF PROTEST HEARINGS PURSUANT TO PROPOSITION 218 FOR NEW OR INCREASED PROPERTY RELATED FEES AND CHARGES

WHEREAS, the City of Rio Dell provides water services and seeks to adjust water service rates; and

WHEREAS, California law regulates the process by which fees for water services are set and those processes are prescribed for in State law; and

WHEREAS, Article XIII D of the California Constitution requires that cities meet certain procedural and substantive requirements when adopting a new or increased property related fees or charges, and the proposition 218 Omnibus Implementation Act (Government Code 53750 and following), as amended, provides additional guidance as to the procedures to be followed; and

WHEREAS, in order to comply with those procedures and conduct fair and accurate protest hearings, the City Council wishes to adopt local procedures;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Rio Dell as follows:

SECTION 1. The City Council hereby declares its intent, in adopting this resolution, to adopt procedures that are consistent with, and in compliance with, Article XIII D of the California Constitution and the Proposition 218 Omnibus Implementation Act.

SECTION 2. The City Council hereby approves the "Procedures for the Submissions and Tabulation of Protest Votes" as set forth in this Resolution and a part of it.

SECTION 3. The language of the "Procedures for the Submissions and Tabulation of Protest Votes" is as follows:

PROCEDURES FOR THE SUBMISSION AND TABULATION OF PROTEST VOTES

DEFINITIONS

Unless the context plainly indicates another meaning was intended, the following definitions shall apply in construction of these Guidelines:

1. "Parcel" means a County Assessor's parcel the owner or occupant of which is subject to the proposed charge that is the subject of the hearing.
2. "Record customer" and "customer of record" mean the person or persons whose name or names appear on the City's records as the person who has contracted for, and is obligated to pay for, utility services to a particular utility account.
3. "Record owner" or "parcel owner" means the person or persons whose name or names appear on the County Assessor's latest equalized assessment roll as the owner of a parcel
4. A "fee protest proceeding" is not an election, but the City Clerk will maintain the confidentiality of protests as provided below and will maintain the security and integrity of protests at all times.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RATES AND PUBLIC HEARING

1. Notice Delivery
 - a. The City shall give notice of proposed charges via U.S. Mail to all record owners and customers of record served by the District
 - b. The City will post the notice of proposed charges and public hearing at its official posting site.

SUBMISSION OF PROTEST

1. Protest submittal
 - a. Any record owner or customer of record who is subject to the proposed utility charge which is the subject of the hearing may submit a written protest to the City Clerk by
 - i. Delivery to the City Clerk's Office 675 Wildwood Ave., Rio Dell, CA
 - ii. Mail to the City of Rio Dell – RATE PROTEST, 675 Wildwood Ave., Rio Dell, CA
 - iii. Personally submitting the protest at the public hearing
 - b. Protests must be received by the end of the public hearing, including those mailed to the City. No postmarks will be accepted; therefore, any protest not

actually received by the close of the hearing, whether or not mailed prior to the hearing, shall not be counted.

- c. Emailed, faxed, and photocopied protests shall not be counted.
- d. Although oral comments at the public hearing will not qualify as a formal protest unless accompanied by a written protest, the City Council welcomes input from the community during the public hearing on the proposed charges.

2. Protest Requirements

- a. A written protest must include:
 - i. A statement that it is a protest against the proposed change which is the subject of the hearing
 - ii. Name of record owner or customer of record
 - iii. Identity of the affected parcel by assessor's parcel number or service address
 - iv. Original signature of the record owner or customer of record with respect to the identified parcel
- b. Protests shall not be counted if any of the required elements (I through IV) outlined in the preceding subsection "a" are omitted

3. Protest Withdrawal

- a. Any person who submits a protest may withdraw that protest by submitting to the City Clerk a written request that the protest be withdrawn. The withdrawal of a protest shall contain sufficient information to identify the affected parcel and the name of the record owner or customer of record who submitted both the protest and the request that it be withdrawn.

4. Multiple Record Owners or Customer of Record

- a. Each record owner or customer of record of a parcel served by the City may submit a protest. This includes instances where
 - i. A parcel is owned by more than a single record owner or more than one name appears on the City's records as the customer of record for the parcel, or
 - ii. A customer of record is not the record owner, or
 - iii. A parcel includes more than one record customer, or
 - iv. Multiple parcels are served via a single utility account, as master-metered multiple family residential units
- b. Only one protest will be counted per parcel as provided by Government Code Section 53755(b)

5. Transparency, Confidentiality, and Disclosure

- a. To ensure transparency and accountability in the fee protest tabulation while protecting the privacy rights of record owners and customer of record, protests will be maintained in confidence until tabulation begins following the public hearing
- b. Once a protest is opened during the tabulation, it becomes a disclosable public record, as required by state law.

TABULATION OF PROTESTS

1. City Clerk

- a. The City clerk shall not accept as valid any protest if he or she determines that any of the following is true:
 - i. The protest does not state its opposition to the proposed charges
 - ii. The protest does not name the record owner or record customer of the parcel identified in the protest as of the date of the public hearing
 - iii. The protest does not identify a parcel served by the City which is subject to the proposed charge
 - iv. The protest does not bear an original signature of the named record owner or record customer with respect to the parcel identified on the protest. Whether a signature is valid shall be entrusted to the reasonable judgment of the City Clerk, who may consult signatures on file with the County Elections Official and/or the City
 - v. The protest was altered in a way that raises a fair question as to whether the protest actually expresses the intent of a record owner or a customer of record to protest the charges
 - vi. The protest was not received by the City Clerk before the close of the public hearing on the proposed charges
 - vii. A request to withdraw the protest was received prior to the close of the public hearing on the proposed charges

2. City Clerk's Decision is Final

- a. The City Clerk's decision that a protest is not valid shall constitute a final action of the City and shall not be subject to any internal appeal.

3. Majority Protest

- a. A majority protest exists if written protest are timely submitted and not withdrawn by the record owners or customers of record with respect to a majority (50% + 1) of the parcels subject to the proposed charge.
- b. While the district may inform the public of a number of parcels served by the District when a notice of proposed rates is mailed, the number of parcels with

active customer accounts served by the District on the date of the hearing shall control in determining whether a majority protest exists

4. Tabulation of protests

- a. At the conclusion of the public hearing, the City Clerk shall tabulate all protests received; including those received during the public hearing, and shall report the results of the tabulation to the City Council. If the total number of protests received is insufficient to constitute a majority protest, the City Clerk may determine the absence of a majority protest without validating the protests received, but may instead deem them all valid without further examination.

5. Report of Tabulation

- a. If at the conclusion of the public hearing the City Clerk determines that he or she will require additional time to tabulate the protests, he or she shall so advise the City Council, which may adjourn the meeting to allow the tabulation to be completed on another day or days. If so, the City Council shall declare the time and place of tabulation, which shall be conducted in a place where interested members of the public may observe the tabulation, and the City Council shall declare the time at which the meeting shall be resumed to receive and act on the tabulation report of the City Clerk
- b. The City Clerk shall prepare, or cause to be prepared, a Master Parcel List identifying each parcel subject to the new or increased fee and also representing any protest vote for that parcel.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Rio Dell in the County of Humboldt, State of California, on the 6th day of October, 2015 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Frank Wilson, Mayor

ATTEST:

I, Karen Dunham, City Clerk for the City of Rio Dell, State of California, hereby certify that the above and foregoing to be a full, true and correct copy of Resolution 1271-2015 adopted by the City of Rio Dell on the 6th day of October, 2015.

Karen Dunham, City Clerk, City of Rio Dell

DRAFT



675 Wildwood Avenue
Rio Dell, CA 95562
(707) 764-3532
(707) 764-5480 (fax)

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
ON PROPOSED NEW/INCREASED WATER RATES

- WHEN:** December 1, 2015
- WHERE:** Rio Dell City Hall Chambers
675 Wildwood Avenue
Rio Dell, California 95562
- PURPOSE:** To receive public comment on a proposal for the City Council to consider adopting new/increased water rates. If approved, the new/increased rates will begin appearing on utility arriving in January of 2016. At the public hearing, the City Council will accept oral testimony as well as written protests regarding the water rates.

Notice is hereby given that at the date, time and place shown above, the City Council of the City of Rio Dell will hold a public hearing to consider a proposed increase to the rates the City charges its water customers. The funds for these rates provide water service, including operating costs, capital costs and debt service payments. Our customers water bill is calculated using a monthly base rate and an additional unit charge based on the amount of water used, as shown in the following table. Water charges are billed monthly.

If approved by the City Council, the rate increase will be reflected on bills arriving in January to the amounts shown in Table 1 and will increase in January of the following five years. The increased amounts are also shown in Table 1.

Written protests to the proposed rates may be submitted by Water Customers or Property Owners before the closing of the public hearing. Written protests will be accepted and tabulated according to procedures that the City Council adopted on October 6, 2015. Pursuant to California Government Code Section 53755(a)(3)(b), only one written protest will be counted per parcel. If protests are received from property owners or customers with respect to a majority of the parcels served by the City's water utility, then the City Council cannot approve the proposed rate increase.

To be included in the protest count the protest must

- BE SIGNED
- INCLUDE THE ADDRESS OF THE OWNER OR CUSTOMER SUBMITTING THE PROTEST
- BE RECEIVED (BY MAIL OR HAND DELIVERY) BEFORE THE END OF THE PUBLIC HEARING ON DECEMBER 1, 2015
- STATE THAT THE OWNER OR CUSTOMER PROTESTS THE PROPOSED WATER RATE INCREASE
- OTHERWISE COMPLY WITH THE CITY'S ADOPTED PROTEST PROCEDURES

DRAFT

Written protest may be submitted at the hearing on December 1, 2015 or mailed to the following address:

City of Rio Dell Water Rate Protest
675 Wildwood Avenue
Rio Dell, California 95562

If you have any questions about this notice of the proposed water rate increases please contact Brooke Woodcox at 707.764.3532, or by email bwoodcox@riodellcity.com.

City of Rio Dell
WATER RATE INCREASE SCHEDULE
FY 2015-16 through FY 2020-21

| CURRENT RATES | | PROPOSED RATES | | | | | | |
|---|-------|----------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Y-1 | | | Y-1 | Y-2 | Y-3 | Y-4 | Y-5 | Y-6 |
| THRU 12/31/15 | | | FY 2015-16 | FY 2016-17 | FY 2017-18 | FY 2018-19 | FY 2019-20 | FY 2020-21 |
| BASE RATE In City | 27.84 | BASE | 37.65 | 38.58 | 46.63 | 47.55 | 48.53 | 48.53 |
| BASE RATE Out City | 41.79 | | | | | | | |
| COST PER UNIT OF WATER USED. One unit of water is equal to 100 cubic feet or 748 gallons. | | | | | | | | |
| Unit 1 | - | UNIT | 2.46 | 2.52 | 3.04 | 3.10 | 3.17 | 3.17 |
| Unit 2-9 | 2.51 | | | | | | | |
| Unit 10 + | 3.78 | | | | | | | |
| Unit 2-9 Out City | 3.78 | | | | | | | |
| Unit 10 + Out City | 5.67 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| DINSMORE ZONE | - | CHARGE | 32.60 | 32.68 | 65.21 | 65.36 | 65.51 | 65.51 |

Rates increase January 1, 2016 and on July 1, 2016 through 2020

To calculate your new bill: Multiply the number of units you use in an average month with the figure under "Cost Per Unit" (Unit 1) and add the base rate from the box above. If you live in the Dinsmore Zone, add the Dinsmore Zone surcharge for the correct year.

Why am I receiving this Notice?

You are receiving this notice because our records indicate that you are listed as an account holder and/or as the owner of a parcel receiving water service from the City of Rio Dell. The purpose of this notice is to give you information about proposed new/increased water rates and how you can participate in the rate setting process.

Rate History

The last major change to the water rates occurred in 2005. At that point in time major upgrades were underway to increase water quality by moving the source of the City's water to the Eel River and also building a new filtration plant. The City incurred 0% interest loans from the State of California to pay for these upgrades. While the 2005 rate adjustment took into account these new debt payments, they did not set aside funds for the replacement of other components of the system.

DRAFT

Since the 2005 water rate adjustment, the City has been largely unsuccessful in securing grant dollars to fund replacement of the distribution (piping) system. Other components are aging and will eventually need to be replaced. Water Tanks, meters, filtration systems and other components all eventually need to be replaced. Instead of building up capital replacement dollars over the past ten years, the city has gone in the opposite direction. Over the past ten years since 2005, water fund reserves have declined and the balance in these accounts will be zero by June 30, 2016. The City has been warned by both the Federal and State government's that revenues into the water fund are insufficient to meet the long-term needs of the system.

The City of Rio Dell works each day with increasingly limited resources to ensure that the residents and businesses receive clean, safe, and reliable water service. To do this, the system must be maintained to all required standards.

New Water Rate Structure Methodology

The City was able to save upward of \$30,000 in consulting fees for this rate adjustment study by using experts from the Rural Community Assistance Corporation.

Since the passage of Proposition 218 in 1996, there have been major changes in how cities are allowed to set rates for water services. To comply with State law, this proposed rate adjustment means that everyone will be charged for strictly the cost of the water services provided to you. By law, your water rates can only be used to cover the cost of providing this service. Therefore, the new rate structure eliminates the "free unit" included in the base charge of your current water bill. The new rate also divides the water system into pressure zones, to avoid any subsidy of rural water users by the urban core of the city. (See Dinsmore Zone)

On August 4, 2015 the City Council discussed long-term goals for the water system. The Council eventually adopted a measured 6-year plan to accumulate 20% of the cost of repairing several high priority items within the water system. Under this scenario, the Council is hoping to use these funds as leverage to acquire state or federal grant dollars to cover the remaining 80% of costs. The City Council unanimously adopted a revenue plan that called for \$1,105,151 in annual funding to achieve this plan.

Many costs of the water system are fixed; they do not change with the changes in water usage. Under the current proposal, 75% of the water system's revenue will be a fixed monthly charge, and 25% will be based off of volume; the amount of water you use. All volumetric charges will be assigned a fixed dollar amount, based on units of water (748 gallons equal one unit). This 75%/25% split under the propose water rates resembles the current rate split.

Addition of Metropolitan Wells Costs

Since 2014, the City has been pursuing an emergency water supply at the old well site in Metropolitan. The project is approximately 95% funded with state and federal dollars and is scheduled for completion around the first quarter of 2016. The new rates will include funds to maintain this new piece of infrastructure for use during emergency events or high river turbidity. Initial operating costs are expected to be around \$13,550 in the first year.

Automatic Adjustments to Water Rates

Current water rates are adjusted 3% annually to cover the costs associated with annual inflation. Under the new proposal, only the rates associated with operations and the Metropolitan Well Site will be adjusted 3% annually for inflation. Debt service and capital funds will not be used to calculate the annual

DRAFT

increase for inflation since these costs are typically not associated with inflationary pressures. The Council must readopt any inflationary increase at least once every five years.

How Will Our Water Rates Compare with Other Communities in the Area?

COMPARISON BY CITY - CURRENT RATE

| | | Base | 5 Units | Total Bill |
|----|--------------------------|--------|----------|------------|
| 1 | McKinleyville | 15.80 | 5.80 | 21.60 |
| 2 | Fortuna | 23.04 | Included | 23.04 |
| 3 | Redway | 20.00 | 9.23 | 29.23 |
| 4 | Blue Lake | 25.01 | 8.91 | 33.92 |
| 5 | Rio Dell | 27.84 | 10.04 | 37.88 |
| 6 | Cloverdale | 20.50 | 18.30 | 38.80 |
| 7 | Eureka | 35.10 | 10.30 | 45.40 |
| 8 | Ukiah | 32.25 | 13.65 | 45.90 |
| 9 | Ferndale | 22.30 | 24.05 | 46.35 |
| 10 | Willits | 26.46 | 25.26 | 51.72 |
| 11 | Healdsburg | 38.02 | 22.45 | 60.47 |
| 12 | Arcata | 47.00 | 15.15 | 62.15 |
| 13 | Trinidad | 42.67 | 20.85 | 63.52 |
| 14 | Garberville | 60.22 | 3.50 | 63.72 |
| 15 | Brooktrails-N of Willits | 109.19 | 10.75 | 119.94 |

COMPARISON BY CITY - PROPOSED RATE

| | | Base | 5 Units | Total Bill |
|----|--------------------------|--------|----------|------------|
| 1 | McKinleyville | 15.80 | 5.80 | 21.60 |
| 2 | Fortuna | 23.04 | Included | 23.04 |
| 3 | Redway | 20.00 | 9.23 | 29.23 |
| 4 | Blue Lake | 25.01 | 8.91 | 33.92 |
| 5 | Cloverdale | 20.50 | 18.30 | 38.80 |
| 6 | Eureka | 35.10 | 10.30 | 45.40 |
| 7 | Ukiah | 32.25 | 13.65 | 45.90 |
| 8 | Ferndale | 22.30 | 24.05 | 46.35 |
| 9 | Willits | 26.46 | 25.26 | 51.72 |
| 10 | Healdsburg | 38.02 | 22.45 | 60.47 |
| 11 | Rio Dell | 46.63 | 15.20 | 61.83 |
| 12 | Arcata | 47.00 | 15.15 | 62.15 |
| 13 | Trinidad | 42.67 | 20.85 | 63.52 |
| 14 | Garberville | 60.22 | 3.50 | 63.72 |
| 15 | Brooktrails-N of Willits | 109.19 | 10.75 | 119.94 |

63% Inc.
(75/25 Split)

How Quickly will the Rates be Established?

The City Council has directed that the new rates be phased in. The first increase would be received by customers in January 2016 for the December 2015 billing period. This would raise rates 50% of the way towards the new goal. Two years after this initial rate increase, the rate would be raised to the full amount directed by the Council. During this period, all 3% inflation adjustments called for in the new rates would occur annually based on the rates charged at those points in time.


The New Dinsmore Zone Surcharge

The new rates also include major changes for customers on the western and southwestern areas of the water system. Currently, all customers outside of city limits are charged an additional 50% to receive water. The new rate eliminates this system and replaces it with a structure based on actual projected costs. The water system is divided into two major pressure zones. The "Main Zone" is fed and pressurized by the Douglas and Painter street tanks. The "Dinsmore Zone" is pressurized by the Dinsmore Tank which is fed by the Main Zone water supply. In order to lower the costs of providing water to the Main Zone customers, this current rate proposal separates the Dinsmore Zone from the

DRAFT

Main Zone, and adds a separate surcharge for Dinsmore Zone customers. This Dinsmore Surcharge is dedicated to the maintenance of the Dinsmore Zone.

Currently, there are 29 Dinsmore Zone customers. To see if you are subject to the Dinsmore Zone surcharge, see the below list of Dinsmore Zone Customers to see if either your name, address or subdivision water district is listed.

| <div style="text-align: center;"> City of Rio Dell  </div> | | |
|--|--|-----------------------|
| Public Works - Water DINSMORE ZONE CUSTOMERS, August 18, 2015 | | |
| CUSTOMER NAME | LOCATION | In/Out of City Limits |
| DELGADO, PEDRO | 622 MONUMENT RD | IN |
| WATERS, A. DUNN & N. | 624 MONUMENT RD | IN |
| GILBERT, JAMIE | 628 MONUMENT RD | IN |
| STADTER, LINDA M | 926 MONUMENT RD | OUT |
| BATTAGLIA, KAREN | 1020 MONUMENT RD | OUT |
| FLEMING, JOHN | 1042 MONUMENT RD | OUT |
| ANDERSON, MELVIN J. | 1054 MONUMENT RD | OUT |
| PEAVEY(1), BARBARA | 1110 MONUMENT RD | OUT |
| HARRISON, STEPHEN | 1118 MONUMENT RD | OUT |
| YAPLE, ARYN | 1154 MONUMENT RD | OUT |
| CHANG, DAVID & BEVERLY | 1172 MONUMENT RD | OUT |
| MEGAZZI, MIKE | 1180 MONUMENT RD | OUT |
| MOORE, MYRNA | 1208 MONUMENT RD | OUT |
| CROZIER, DENNIS | 1264 MONUMENT RD | OUT |
| TATUM, BONNIE | 1330 MONUMENT RD | OUT |
| BROWNELL, GARY | 1390 MONUMENT RD | OUT |
| STURDEVANT, SETH | 1401 MONUMENT RD | OUT |
| COLOSIO, JANELLE & MARK | 1412 MONUMENT RD | OUT |
| CIDONI, LINDA | 1555 MONUMENT RD | OUT |
| BRAVO, LARRY | 1600 MONUMENT RD | OUT |
| LOMMORI, MIKE | 1615 MONUMENT RD | OUT |
| MONUMENT SUB. WATER DIST. | 1789 MONUMENT RD (4 TOTAL LOCATIONS ON THIS METER) | OUT |
| HAGEMANN, DAVID | 2020 MONUMENT RD | OUT |
| MELCHOR, CAGUANA | 720 DINSMORE RANCH ROAD | IN |
| DENNING, JOEL | 1150 DINSMORE RANCH ROAD | IN |
| HALL, BRYAN | 1200 DINSMORE RANCH ROAD | IN |

The Dinsmore Zone is a separate pressure zone in the Rio Dell Water system. If your name (or water billing address, or Subdivision Water District) appears on this list, it means you and your property are within the Dinsmore pressure zone and will be charged the Dinsmore Zone rate. This zone begins from the Douglas Booster Station that services the Dinsmore Tank and piping to your water meter.

DRAFT

How do I calculate my rates?

Use the chart below to calculate your rate for your new average water rate for year one. For example, if your average water use is 5 units per month, your water bill will go from \$37.88 to \$49.95 per month. That's an increase of \$12.07 per month.

The new base rate is \$37.65 per month and per unit consumption charge is \$2.46 per unit used.

| <div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> CURRENT </div> | | 2015-2016 | |
|---|--------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| UNITS | WATER RATES | Y1 | Add'l Cost |
| 0 | 27.84 | 37.65 | 9.81 |
| 1 | 27.84 | 40.11 | 12.27 |
| 2 | 30.35 | 42.57 | 12.22 |
| 3 | 32.86 | 45.03 | 12.17 |
| 4 | 35.37 | 47.49 | 12.12 |
| 5 | 37.88 | 49.95 | 12.07 |
| 6 | 40.39 | 52.41 | 12.02 |
| 7 | 42.90 | 54.87 | 11.97 |
| 8 | 45.41 | 57.33 | 11.92 |
| 9 | 47.92 | 59.79 | 11.87 |
| 10 | 54.09 | 62.25 | 8.16 |
| 11 | 57.75 | 64.71 | 6.96 |
| 12 | 61.41 | 67.17 | 5.76 |
| 13 | 65.07 | 69.63 | 4.56 |
| 14 | 68.73 | 72.09 | 3.36 |
| 15 | 72.39 | 74.55 | 2.16 |
| 16 | 76.05 | 77.01 | 0.96 |
| 17 | 79.71 | 79.47 | (0.24) |
| 18 | 83.37 | 81.93 | (1.44) |
| 19 | 87.03 | 84.39 | (2.64) |
| 20 | 90.69 | 86.85 | (3.84) |

*Rio Dell City Hall
675 Wildwood Avenue
Rio Dell, CA 95562
(707) 764-3532
riodellcity.com*



October 6, 2015

TO: Rio Dell City Council

FROM: Kyle Knopp, City Manager 

SUBJECT: Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Local Transportation Revenue Options
Being Considered by the Humboldt County Association of Governments Policy
Advisory Committee

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE CITY COUNCIL:

No Specific Recommendation

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

This item is presented at the request of Vice-Mayor Johnson. The Vice-Mayor is also the Council's appointed representative to the Humboldt County Association of Governments (HCAOG). Attached is a HCOAG staff report covering the topic at hand.

///



HUMBOLDT COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
611 I Street, Suite B
Eureka, CA 95501
www.hcaog.net

AGENDA ITEM 6b
PAC Meeting
September 17, 2015

DATE: September 10, 2015
TO: HCAOG Policy Advisory Committee (PAC)
FROM: Marcella Clem, Executive Director
SUBJECT: **Local Transportation Revenue Options Update**

STAFF REPORT

Contents:

- Staff's Recommended Action
- Staff Summary
- HCAOG Local Transportation Revenue Option Workshop Meeting Summary and Suggested Work Plan
- Meeting Polling Results from the Workshop
- Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure Survey (2008)

Staff's Recommended Action:

1. Introduce the item as an action item;
2. Allow staff to present the item;
3. Receive public comment;
4. Discuss item and consider making the motion:
"The PAC recommends that the HCAOG Board direct staff to move forward with the steps necessary to fund a local transportation revenue options public poll to be conducted this Fall."

Staff Summary:

On August 26, 2015, HCAOG held a workshop to discuss the state of transportation funding and discuss local revenue options. At their September meeting, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed the *Meeting Summary and Suggested Work Plan* and meeting polling results. The TAC also discussed public survey results conducted in June of 2008.

In discussing possible next steps, the TAC recommends moving forward only with a new poll this Fall. The TAC sees a new poll as a kind of litmus test which would determine whether or not to proceed with additional next steps. The TAC would only be in support of moving forward with high results. A ballpark estimate for sales tax polling is \$30,000. With HCAOG Board

direction, staff will research costs and lessons learned from other regional transportation agencies in the state. Staff is currently reconciling the 2014-15 budget to determine what existing funding is available. At least \$10,000 in local funds, approved in the current budget are available. These funds were set aside to pay for 'Review Engagements' of four transit agencies that receive HCAOG funding through third party contracts. The auditing cannot begin until July of 2016.

Humboldt County Association of Governments Local Transportation Revenue Option Workshop Meeting Summary and Suggested Work Plan

Meeting Summary:

On Wednesday August 26th, 2015 the Humboldt County Association of Governments (HCAOG) held a Local Transportation Revenue Option Workshop from 3:30 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. at the Wharfinger Building in Eureka. The workshop was attended by over 30 community leaders, including local government staff, elected officials, and members of the public.

The agenda included a welcome from the HCAOG Chair Susan Ornelas and self introductions by the attendees. A transportation funding overview presentation was provided by Eileen Goodwin, President, Apex Strategies. The overview included an interactive voting session where attendees were asked at various times during the two hour and half session to weigh in on various topics ranging from the amount of the current gas tax to thoughts of current legislation to possible additional funding mechanisms. A copy of the PowerPoint and including a copy of the voting results can be found on line at <http://www.hcaog.net/calendar/date/local-transportation-revenue-options-workshop>.

The presentation specifically covered the context of transportation funding as it relates to historical sources for funds at both the state and federal level, the buying power and fuel economy impacts to the gas tax funding source, the impact of the state's "borrowing" of transportation funding and the payback mechanisms. There was a discussion about the SBX 1-1 funding proposal which would raise revenue and would support state highway and local streets and road maintenance projects as well as create a reward fund for new transportation sales tax counties.

The presentation also covered the current pilot project to use vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as a potential way to generate revenue. Eileen explained the various methodologies currently being studied and presented a timeline for the VMT Pilot Project.

Some of the key results from the polling include:

- 57% of the attendees feel the current state and federal gas tax is not enough to adequately fund transportation;
- 79% of the attendees feel that the state's budget 40% coverage of identified transportation priorities is not adequate;
- 79% of the attendees feel the state and federal governments are unlikely to solve the transportation funding problem;

- The two highest funding priorities from the group included maintenance (59%) and more transportation choices/mobility options (28%);
- The three most popular local control funding options ideas were ¼ cent countywide sales tax (36%), ½ cent countywide sales tax (29%), and local gas tax increase (18%); and
- When asked whether the group favored looking at a potential funding option for the ballot in 2016 70% were interested in continuing the exploration of the topic, 5% were ready to move to be on the ballot now and 25% felt that the community would not be ready for 2016.

HCAOG Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members provided a panel to present and discuss challenges related to their specific role. The panel was moderated by Eileen and included Kevin Tucker, Chief of North Planning, Caltrans; Tom Mattson, Director of Public Works, Humboldt County; Marcella Clem, Executive Director of the Humboldt County Association of Governments; Praj White, City Engineer for the City of Ferndale; Doby Class, City Engineer-Public Works Director for the City of Arcata, and Charles Roecklin, City Engineer for the City of Eureka. Some of the themes from the speakers included: grants program no longer have a geographic equity component which makes it extra difficult for smaller rural counties to attract funds; it is difficult for local agencies to meet local match requirements because revenues are so limited; partnerships are very important between agencies especially between the cities; there are many more needs than there is money—maintenance of roads and bridges is very important because neglecting maintenance makes project costs go up; the performance based and data based grant process is here to stay yet a challenge because it is expensive to collect data and administer state and federal grants; and greenhouse gas emission reduction is a key element in what does get funded with rural areas not competing well for this type of funding. The panelists took questions from the audience.

For the last session, Eileen presented some typical next steps on moving forward with consideration of additional funding focusing in on the funding mechanisms that require public votes. The Suggested Work Plan follows below.

Chairperson Ornelas took the floor to thank Eileen, the TAC Panel, and HCAOG staff for the excellent workshop meeting.

The Workshop Adjourned at 6:00

Suggested Work Plan:

Since 75% of those attending indicated a desire to keep exploring this topic in anticipation of a potential ballot measure in 2016, the recommended next steps for HCAOG include:

- Continue to talk about the funding alternatives to narrow down the options;
- Conduct a poll of likely November 2016 voters in Fall/Winter 2015:
 - Assess funding options with likely voters (1/4 cent versus 1/2 cent etc. versus other potential options)
 - Assess project priorities with likely voters (maintenance versus capital versus investment in mobility options);
- Continue stakeholder outreach and input;
- Determine appropriate voter safeguards (i.e. limits on expenditures, oversight committee, annual audits etc.);
- After the polling results and stakeholder input is received, begin to develop a draft expenditure plan;
- Determine if additional environmental clearance is necessary;
- Coordinate with County Clerk on various ballot deadlines and costs;
- Expand community and stakeholder outreach and input once plan is developed—get input on the plan;
- Check in with voters through poll Spring 2016 to determine readiness for November 2016:
 - Include draft ballot question with word limit, project list, voter safeguards etc.; and
 - HCAOG to deliberate being on the ballot by August 2016 deadline.

Workshop summary and suggested work plan created by Eileen Goodwin, Apex Strategies

Session NameHCAOG Funding Options Workshop
8-26-2015 6:08 PM**Date Created**

8/26/2015 6:15:00 PM

Active Participants

29

Total Participants

29

Questions

7

Results by Question

1. Our existing 63 cents tax per gallon seems... (Multiple Choice)

1. Too much
2. Not enough
3. Just about right

Totals

| Responses | | |
|-----------|--|-------|
| Percent | | Count |
| 14.29% | | 4 |
| 57.14% | | 16 |
| 28.57% | | 8 |
| 100% | | 28 |

2. The current 40% coverage of need seems like... (Multiple Choice)

1. Too much, there are other priorities for this money.
2. Not enough money to transportation needs - roads are falling apart.
3. Just about what it should be.

Totals

| Responses | | |
|-----------|--|-------|
| Percent | | Count |
| 3.45% | | 1 |
| 79.31% | | 23 |
| 17.24% | | 5 |
| 100% | | 29 |

3. I think the Federal and State Governments will solve this funding issue for us (Multiple Choice)

| Responses | |
|-----------|-------|
| Percent | Count |
| 20.69% | 6 |
| 79.31% | 23 |

1. Agree. It is what they are there for.
2. No way. Things are too dysfunctional now & the presidential election cycle will only delay any real solutions.

4. Define the Problem (Multiple Choice)

| Responses | |
|-----------|-------|
| Percent | Count |
| 58.62% | 17 |
| 3.45% | 1 |
| 27.59% | 8 |
| 0.00% | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0 |
| 3.45% | 1 |
| 6.90% | 2 |
| 100% | 29 |

1. Maintenance
2. Seniors/School children mobility
3. Community needs more transportation options/choices
4. Congestion relief
5. Gateways
6. Something else
7. All of the above

Totals

5. What Additional Sources of Funding Might be Attractive? Vote (Multiple Choice)

1. Local gas tax
2. Parcel/property tax
3. Developer fee
4. Payroll taxes
5. Countywide sales tax of ½ cent
6. Countywide sales tax of ¼ cent
7. No more taxes - do fewer projects

Totals

| Responses | | |
|-------------|--|-----------|
| Percent | | Count |
| 17.86% | | 5 |
| 3.57% | | 1 |
| 7.14% | | 2 |
| 0.00% | | 0 |
| 28.57% | | 8 |
| 35.71% | | 10 |
| 7.14% | | 2 |
| 100% | | 28 |

6. Which project seems most important? (Multiple Choice)

1. Filling potholes
2. Bike lanes and or bike trails
3. Goods movement – Harbor access
4. Bus service expansion
5. Highway maintenance
6. Highway expansion
7. Street lights

Totals

| Responses | | |
|-------------|--|-----------|
| Percent | | Count |
| 55.56% | | 15 |
| 14.81% | | 4 |
| 0.00% | | 0 |
| 18.52% | | 5 |
| 7.41% | | 2 |
| 0.00% | | 0 |
| 3.70% | | 1 |
| 100% | | 27 |

7. Seems Like a Sales Tax in 2016...
(Multiple Choice)

1. Sounds exciting, I like the added incentive. We should get going, we have waited too long.
2. We are not ready for 2016.
3. I don't know if we are ready or not, but I do think we should take the next steps. Do polling and see if there is voter interest – the need is there.

Totals

| Responses | |
|-----------|-------|
| Percent | Count |
| 5.00% | 1 |
| 25.00% | 5 |
| 70.00% | 14 |
| 100% | 20 |



Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure Survey

Survey Conducted:
June 16-19, 2008

220-2460

Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates
Opinion Research & Public Policy Analysis

Santa Monica, CA – Oakland, CA – Madison, WI – Mexico City

Methodology

- **800 telephone interviews with Humboldt County voters likely to cast ballots in the November 2008 general election**
- **Interviews conducted between June 16-19, 2008**
- **Margin of sampling error of +/- 3.5%**

Key Findings

- **A plurality of voters believe that the County is headed in the wrong direction**
 - **General economic and cost-of-living concerns appear to be the primary drivers of these impressions**
- **A solid majority of voters support a sales tax measure funding transportation projects, but support levels fall short of the two-thirds threshold**
- **Voters prioritize spending potential sales tax funds on repairing roads and bridges, and expanding bus service, particularly with low-emission buses**
- **Total support increases after pro and con arguments, but fails to reach the required two-thirds threshold**
- **As a result, a transportation sales tax does not appear viable for the November 2008 election; 2010 offers a potential alternative**

Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure


*Fairbank,
Maslin,
Maullin &
Associates*

*Opinion Research &
Public Policy Analysis*

Slide 4

Perceptions of the Community

**Voters are somewhat pessimistic
about the direction of the County.**




2. Would you say things in Humboldt County are going in the right direction, or are they off on the wrong track?

Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure

Unemployment and the economy are on the top of voters' minds...

Slide 6

(Open-ended)



3. What do you think is the most serious issue facing the residents of Humboldt County that you would like to see local government do something about?

Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure


...and are seen as the most important
problems compared to other issues.

Slide 7

Opinion Research &
Public Policy Analysis

(Ranked by Extremely Serious Problem)

■ Ext. Ser. ■ Very Ser. □ S.W. Ser. ■ Not Ser. □ No Opin.



8. I'm going to read you a list of issues, and I'd like you to tell me how serious a problem you think each one is in Humboldt County. Please tell me whether you consider it to be an extremely serious problem, a very serious problem, a somewhat serious problem, or not too serious a problem for people who live in Humboldt County. Split Sample


Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure

Opinion Research &
Public Policy Analysis

Slide 8

Continued

■ Ext. Ser. ■ Very Ser. □ S.W. Ser. ■ Not Ser. □ No Opin.



8. I'm going to read you a list of issues, and I'd like you to tell me how serious a problem you think each one is in Humboldt County. Please tell me whether you consider it to be an extremely serious problem, a very serious problem, a somewhat serious problem, a not too serious a problem for people who live in Humboldt County. Split Sample

Attitudes Toward a Transportation Sales Tax Measure

Measure Ballot Language Tested

THE HUMBOLDT COUNTY ROAD REPAIR AND SAFETY IMPROVEMENT ACT:


To repave and improve local highways, streets and roads; fix potholes; widen and repair streets and bridges; improve safety on local streets and highways; build and repair sidewalks, trails and bike paths and improve pedestrian safety; resolve traffic problems; and expand bus and public transit service; shall Humboldt County enact a one-half cent sales tax for 30 years, subject to citizen oversight and independent audits?

4. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes in favor of this measure or No to oppose it?

Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure

Slide 11

A solid majority of voters support a sales tax measure, but support levels fall short of the two-thirds threshold.



4. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes in favor of this measure or No to oppose it?

Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure

Slide 12

Initial Vote Demographics:


Opinion Research &
Public Policy Analysis

Gender and Party Registration

■ Total Yes ■ Total No □ Undecided

Gender

Party Registration



4. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes in favor of this measure or No to oppose it?

Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure


Initial Vote Demographics:

Slide 13

Optimal Research &
Public Policy Analysis

Age

■ Total Yes ■ Total No □ Undecided



4. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes in favor of this measure or No to oppose it?

Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure

Slide 14


Initial Vote Demographics:

Age by Gender

■ Total Yes ■ Total No □ Undecided

Men

Women



4. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes in favor of this measure or No to oppose it?

Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure


Opinion Research &
Public Policy Analysis

Slide 15

Initial Vote Demographics:

Party by Gender

■ Total Yes ■ Total No □ Undecided



4. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes in favor of this measure or No to oppose it?

Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure

Slide 16

Initial Vote Demographics:


Party by Age

■ Total Yes ■ Total No □ Undecided

Democrat

Republican

Decline to State/Other



4. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes in favor of this measure or No to oppose it?

Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure


Initial Vote Demographics:

Slide 17

Opinion Research &
Public Policy Analysis

Education

■ Total Yes ■ Total No □ Undecided



4. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes in favor of this measure or No to oppose it?

Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure

Fairbank,
Maslin,
Maullin &
Associates


Owens Research &
Public Policy Analysis

Slide 18

Initial Vote Demographics:

Income

■ Total Yes ■ Total No □ Undecided



4. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes in favor of this measure or No to oppose it?

Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure


Initial Vote Demographics:

Household Commute Drivers at Least 3 Days a Week

Slide 19

Opinion Research &
Public Policy Analysis

■ Total Yes ■ Total No □ Undecided



4. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes in favor of this measure or No to oppose it?

Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure


Fairbank,
Maslin,
Maullin &
Associates

Opinion Research &
Public Policy Analysis

Slide 20

Initial Vote Demographics: Public Transportation Use Frequency

■ Total Yes ■ Total No □ Undecided



4. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes in favor of this measure or No to oppose it?


Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure

Initial Vote Demographics: Years Lived in Humboldt County

Slide 21

Opinion Research &
Public Policy Analysis

■ Total Yes ■ Total No □ Undecided



4. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes in favor of this measure or No to oppose it?


Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure

Slide 22

Initial Vote Demographics:

Commute Status

■ Total Yes ■ Total No □ Undecided



4. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes in favor of this measure or No to oppose it?

Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure

*Opinion Research &
Public Policy Analysis*

Top Reasons Offered for Support or Opposition

Slide 23

| Yes | % |
|---|-----|
| Infrastructure/Road/Street/Highway Imps/Repairs | 52% |
| General Positive/Good Idea/Needs To Be Done | 12% |
| Transportation Improvements/Bus Transit Imps | 12% |
| Bike Paths/Trails/Parks | 8% |
| Combination Of Items Included/All Things Mentioned Needed | 7% |
| Cost/Affordable/Worth The Money | 6% |
| Pedestrian Safety/Sidewalk Improvements | 5% |
| Road Safety | 5% |
| Funding/Money Is Needed | 4% |
| Community Benefits/Good For Local Area/Everyone/Quality Of Life | 3% |
| Expansion Of Roads/Streets/Highways | 3% |

| No | % |
|---|-----|
| Taxpayer/Public Funding/Don't Want Increase In Taxes | 43% |
| Funding Not Needed/Won't Spend Right/Should Use Current \$ Better | 31% |
| General Negative/Not Needed/Other Issues Are More Important | 12% |
| Cost/Too Expensive/Can't Afford/Poor Economy | 12% |
| Infrastructure/Road/Street/Highway Imps/Repairs Not Needed | 10% |
| Combination Of Items/Includes Too Many Things | 3% |
| 30-Year Time Period | 3% |

5. In a few words of your own, why would you vote YES/NO on this measure

Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure

**Voters support dedicating the money
to transportation programs and value
potential accountability provisions.**

Slide 24

(Ranked by Much More Likely)

■ Much More Lkly. ■ S.W. More Lkly. ■ S.W./Much Less Lkly. □ No Diff./DK/NA

**By law, the County will be required to use this
money for transportation only and not for
other programs**


**No more than two percent of the money raised
by the tax could be used for administrative
expenses**

**All expenditures will be audited annually by an
independent auditor**

**A citizens' watchdog committee will oversee
the program**

***The tax will end automatically after 20 years**

***The tax will end automatically after 30 years**



9. I am going to mention some different aspects of this ballot measure. Please tell me whether knowing it was a part of this ballot measure would make you more likely or less likely to vote for the measure.

Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure

Slide 25

Spending Priorities for a Transportation Sales Tax Measure

Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure

Slide 26

Proposed Division of Funds

It would create a half-cent sales tax in Humboldt County to fund repairs and improvements to local roads, to be used as follows:

- One-half of the money would be used to fix potholes; repair, repave, and widen streets and roads; and Improve safety on local streets and roads;
- One-sixth of the money would be used to widen, realign, and expand state highways to improve safety and traffic flow;
- One-sixth of the money would be used to improve public transit, with more frequent service, including night and weekend service, and improved bus stops and shelters; and
- One-sixth of the money would be used to improve pedestrian and bicycle paths, and trails.

The tax would automatically end after 30 years, and all expenditures would be subject to annual audits and review by a citizens' oversight committee.


6. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes in favor of this measure or No to oppose it?

Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure


Slide 27

A detailed explanation of how the funds would be apportioned increases support minimally.

Initial Vote




After Explanation



4/6. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes in favor of this measure or No to oppose it?

Voters have mixed opinions about the measure's current division of funds, but there is no consensus on an alternative allocation.



7. In general, do you approve or disapprove of the way the money from this measure would be divided between local street and road repair, state highway improvements, public transit, and pedestrian and bicycle paths and trails?

Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure


Opinion Research &
Public Policy Analysis

Slide 29

Voters prioritize spending potential sales tax funds on repairing roads and bridges, and expanding bus service, particularly with low-emission busses.

(Ranked by Extremely/Very Important)

■ Ext./Very Imp. ■ S.W. Imp. ■ Not Imp. □ DK/NA



10. I am going to read you a list of specific projects that could be funded by the ballot measure I have been describing. Recognizing that there frequently is not enough funding for all such projects, please tell me how important it is to you that each project be undertaken. Would you say it is extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not important. *Split Sample


Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure

Opinion Research &
Public Policy Analysis

Continued

Slide 30

■ Ext./Very Imp. ■ S.W. Imp. ■ Not Imp. □ DK/NA



10. I am going to read you a list of specific projects that could be funded by the ballot measure I have been describing. Recognizing that there frequently is not enough funding for all such projects, please tell me how important it is to you that each project be undertaken. Would you say it is extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not important. *Split Sample


Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure

Continued

Slide 31

Opinion Research &
Public Policy Analysis

■ Ext./Very Imp. ■ S.W. Imp. ■ Not Imp. □ DK/NA



10. I am going to read you a list of specific projects that could be funded by the ballot measure I have been describing. Recognizing that there frequently is not enough funding for all such projects, please tell me how important it is to you that each project be undertaken. Would you say it is extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not important. *Split Sample

Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure

**Fairbank,
Maslin,
Maullin &
Associates**

*Opinion Research &
Public Policy Analysis*

Slide 32

Reactions to Pro and Con Arguments

Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure

**The strongest arguments for the measure
are that it would include tough
accountability provisions and insulate
the county from state budget cuts.**


(Ranked by Very Convincing)

Because of the state budget deficit, state funding for local transportation repairs and improvements is being severely cut. But by passing this measure, we can ensure that Humboldt County will have a reliable source of funding for road repairs, no matter what the state does.

This measure has tough financial accountability provisions including a citizen's watchdog committee and an annual audit by an independent agency with the results published in local newspapers.

Without this measure, traffic safety problems in Humboldt County will continue to increase, with more wrecks on local roads, more local people at risk of injury and death, and increased maintenance costs for vehicles.

■ Very Conv. ■ S.W. Convincing



11. I am going to read you a list of statements from various people who support the ballot measure we have been describing. Please tell me whether you find it very convincing, somewhat convincing, or not convincing as a reason to vote yes on the measure.

Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure

Opinion Research &
Public Policy Analysis

Slide 34

Continued


Many local streets, roads, and bridges are difficult and dangerous for local businesses to use for transporting goods. Passing this measure will help the local economy and jobs by addressing this problem.

The population of Humboldt County is expected to increase by over 18 percent in the next 20 years. If we don't pass this measure, local roads will deteriorate even faster under the pressure of this growth.

If we don't pass this measure, transportation problems in Humboldt County will only get worse and force major businesses and employers to relocate to other areas.

People who live outside Humboldt County would pay a significant share of the half-cent sales tax.

■ Very Conv. ■ S.W. Convincing



11. I am going to read you a list of statements from various people who support the ballot measure we have been describing. Please tell me whether you find it very convincing, somewhat convincing, or not convincing as a reason to vote yes on the measure.

Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure

Opinion Research &
Public Policy Analysis

Slide 35


**The most convincing opposition
argument is that transportation is not
the top priority for the county.**

(Ranked by Very Convincing)

**There are much more important problems than
transportation that we should focus on, like education,
public safety and health care.**

**With the current economic downturn, this is no time to
raise taxes and make the problem worse.**

■ Very Conv. ■ S.W. Convincing



13. I am going to read you a list of statements from various people who oppose the ballot measure we have been describing. Please tell me whether you find it very convincing, somewhat convincing, or not convincing as a reason to vote no on the measure.

Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure

Opinion Research &
Public Policy Analysis


Slide 36

Continued

Taxes are too high already. We should not vote for any new tax increases.

There is already plenty of money available for transportation in our area. It is just misspent or wasted.

This measure is simply not necessary. The condition of county roads and city streets in Humboldt County is not that bad.



13. I am going to read you a list of statements from various people who oppose the ballot measure we have been describing. Please tell me whether you find it very convincing, somewhat convincing, or not convincing as a reason to vote no on the measure.


Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure

*Opinion Research &
Public Policy Analysis*

Slide 37

**Total support increases after
pro and con arguments, but fails
to reach the two-thirds threshold.**

— Total Yes — Total No — Undecided



4/12/14. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes in favor of this measure or No to oppose it?

Humboldt County Transportation Sales Tax Measure

*Fairbank,
Maslin,
Maullin &
Associates*

*Opinion Research &
Public Policy Analysis*

Slide 38

Conclusions and Recommendations

- While a solid majority of voters support a one-half cent transportation sales tax in Humboldt County, support does not reach the two-thirds threshold – even after additional background information and statements from supporters are provided
- Concern about economic conditions, which is particularly sharp in Humboldt County, presents a significant obstacle to voter approval of a sales tax
- The County could consider this measure for a future ballot, perhaps in 2010:
 - This could provide an opportunity to engage the public in an educational outreach program about the need for an infusion of transportation funds and the benefits of improving the County's transportation infrastructure
 - This could provide time for the economy to strengthen and elevate the comfort level of the electorate with a sales tax measure

For more information, contact:

DAVID METZ

**1999 Harrison St., Suite 1290
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone (510) 451-9521
Fax (510) 451-0384
dave@fmma.com**

CURTIS BELOW

**1999 Harrison St., Suite 1290
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone (510) 451-9521
Fax (510) 451-0384
curtis@fmma.com**

Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates

Opinion Research & Public Policy Analysis

Santa Monica - Oakland - Madison, WI - Mexico City

*Rio Dell City Hall
675 Wildwood Avenue
Rio Dell, CA 95562
(707) 764-3532
riodellcity.com*



October 6, 2015

TO: Rio Dell City Council

FROM: Kyle Knopp, City Manager

SUBJECT: Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Electronic Signage for Display on City Hall Grounds or Other City Owned Property.

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE CITY COUNCIL:

No Specific Recommendation

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

This item is presented at the request of Councilmember Garnes who will distribute information at the Council Meeting.

///

*Rio Dell City Hall
675 Wildwood Avenue
Rio Dell, CA 95562
(707) 764-3532
riodelcity.com*



October 6, 2015

TO: Rio Dell City Council

FROM: Kyle Knopp, City Manager

SUBJECT: Discussion and Possible Action to Authorize the City Manager to Cast Votes on Behalf of the City of Rio Dell for the Fortuna Fire Protection District's Proposed Fire Protection, Fire Prevention and Emergency Response Services Assessment

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE CITY COUNCIL:

Authorize the City Manager to vote yes on all Fortuna Fire Protection District ballot assessments on behalf of the City of Rio Dell.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

The City of Rio Dell owns three parcels within the Fortuna Fire Protection District. The three parcels are all located in Metropolitan at the Metropolitan Well Site and the wastewater disposal field. At this time it is believed that only one parcel is actually subject to the assessment.

The City's cost associated with this assessment is expected to be \$216 annually payed by the sewer fund. The parcel in question is planned to be annexed into the City, at which point it is expected that the City will no longer pay the assessment.

///



Official Notice and Ballot

Proposed Fire Protection, Fire Prevention & Emergency Response Services Assessment

Fortuna Fire
Protection District
(707) 725-5021

Why did you receive this ballot?

You are a property owner served by the Fortuna Fire Protection District and are being asked to vote on a proposed funding measure to maintain and improve the level of fire protection service to the community.

The enclosed ballot is your opportunity to participate in deciding whether local funding will be approved for continued and improved fire protection, fire prevention, and emergency response services. Your vote is important because only returned ballots will be counted.

The Fortuna Fire Protection District

The Fortuna Fire Protection District provides fire protection services including prevention, public education, preparedness, and emergency response to the City of Fortuna and outlying communities of Alton, Hydesville, Metropolitan, Fernbridge and Palmer Creek. The area encompasses 26 square miles with a population of 15,000. Five fire companies, consisting of 13 members each, work out of 3 fire stations within the district. The command staff consists of 1 Fire Chief, 2 Assistant Fire Chiefs, and 1 Safety Officer for a total of 69 members. All members are volunteers with exception of the full time Fire Chief position.

The department responds to an average of 300 to 400 emergency calls per year and an additional 120 minor requests for service and/or investigations, normally handled by the command staff. Mutual aid agreements exist for assistance throughout the county, along with auto aid agreements with neighboring fire districts.

Why is a funding measure needed?

Over the past 20 years, there has been a steady decline in volunteerism due to busy life styles, a lack of mom & pop-type businesses with owners and employees that were traditionally available for response, a loss of our mill industries with volunteer response available through shift assignments, and the current demand on volunteers.

The Fortuna Fire Protection District recently conducted a 20-year strategic plan and outreach program aimed at developing a cost-effective plan that will improve the level of service to the community and build a reliable and effective volunteer organization. The proposed services, programs, and improvements would be funded by a benefit assessment levied on parcels within the fire district boundaries. A previous benefit assessment, approved in 1997 at \$3 per unit of benefit, would be repealed if the new assessment, proposed at \$18 per unit of benefit, is approved by property owners.

What would this measure provide?

The increased funding to the Fire District would:

Implement a Comprehensive Fire Prevention Program

The District has an obligation to provide a comprehensive fire prevention program to promote fire and life safety within the community, consisting of:

Inspection & Code Enforcement. Performing inspections at schools, hospitals, senior living centers, motels, apartment complexes, businesses, and assemblies where large numbers of community members gather.

Plan Review. Assuring that the required fire protection is considered in new development within our community.

Fire Pre-Planning. Developing contingency plans to deal with victim rescue, firefighter safety, and fire suppression for buildings which may pose a higher risk.

Public Education. Establishing programs directed at informing members of our community about fire and life safety within their homes, workplace, and schools.

Develop Cost-Effective Staffing Programs

Fire service volunteers are motivated by the opportunity to respond and help citizens in their time of need. Our volunteers can be further motivated to be a part of the organization with advanced and professional training opportunities, as well as a small financial token of appreciation. The following programs and activities would help support our volunteers:

Resident (Internship) Program. A no-cost program offering room and board to volunteers pursuing an education in exchange for a commitment to a minimum number of required 12 hour shifts per month.

Volunteer Shift Program. Reimbursement for basic expenses to volunteers that are willing to staff a 12 hour shift, providing emergency response to the community as well as fulfilling station duties.

Paid Call Program. Minimal pay for attendance to fire/rescue calls and training.

Improve Facilities and Training

Fire station and training facilities are motivational factors for volunteer firefighters. The Campton Heights fire station is in a poor location with a lack of parking, creating a safety hazard for personnel. The facility has been in use for 48 years and is well maintained but undersized for today's fire service. Re-location of this station and construction of a training facility is proposed to enhance training opportunities for our volunteer firefighters.

Proposed Fire Protection, Fire Prevention & Emergency Response Services Assessment

What are the benefits to the community?

- Enhanced fire and life safety within the community by establishing a comprehensive fire prevention program.
- Supplement the City of Fortuna's medical aid response through district volunteer staffing and resident programs, which would allow law enforcement to better serve community expectations, provide citizens with a higher level of service by fire personnel, and motivate our volunteers from a response opportunity standpoint.
- Expanded opportunities for local youth interested in pursuing a career in either the fire service or emergency medical fields by offering volunteer staffing and resident programs.
- Maintain a reliable and efficient volunteer fire department for years to come through implementation of modern and cost-effective programs, and expanded opportunities for our volunteers.

How much is the proposed assessment?

The proposed assessment for your property is printed on the Official Ballot in this notice. The assessment proposal assigns a "unit value" to each property within the District based on the current Land Use Code of the property. The unit assignment varies from 1 unit for a vacant parcel to 20 units for a Heavy Industrial parcel.

For example, a typical single-family residence is assigned 4 Units of Benefit and each Unit of Benefit is assessed at \$18.00 for a total of \$72.00 per year. The Unit of Benefit for other residential property types is based on the number of dwelling units or the relative distance from a water source.

The total estimated amount assessed to the entire area subject to this assessment would be approximately \$485,532.

What about the Benefit Assessment approved in 1997?

In 1997, property owners within the Fire District approved a benefit assessment at a rate of \$3.00 per unit on a use-of-property basis. For a typical single-family residence, the assessment assigns 4 units at \$3.00 for a total of \$12.00 per year.

If the proposed assessment is approved, the prior assessment would be repealed and the new assessment would take its place. Therefore, a typical single-family residence that currently pays \$12.00 per year (4 Units of Benefit at \$3.00 per Unit) would be charged a total of \$72.00 per year, or an additional \$60.00.

Will this assessment increase in the future?

The assessment will continue into the future as long as the Fire District Board approves the annual resolution for continuation of this assessment. The assessment measure has no inflationary provision and will only grow based on new construction activity. While the Fire District Board may determine that the amount of the assessment be maintained or lowered, the assessment cannot be raised above the specified \$18.00 per Unit of Benefit.

How do SRA fees play into this?

Cal Fire has responsibility for wildland fire only in the unincorporated areas of our district and they are not staffed at full capacity throughout the year. The current SRA (state responsibility area) fees are supposed to provide fire prevention activities to property owners that reside in the SRA to address wildland fire prevention issues such as fuel breaks, vegetation clearing, etc. The Fortuna Fire Protection District does not receive any funding through SRA fees.

How does the proposed assessment compare with other fire districts?

Below is a listing of other fire assessments currently in place for several fire districts in Humboldt County. Numbers in parenthesis are proposed amounts by specific districts.

| | <u>Per unit</u> | <u>Per residence</u> |
|-------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Blue Lake Fire District | \$9 (\$39) | \$36 (\$156) |
| Humboldt Fire District | \$18 | \$72 |
| Rio Dell Fire District | \$25 | \$100 |
| Arcata Fire District | \$27 (\$51) | \$108 (\$204) |
| Fortuna Fire District | \$3 (\$18) | \$12 (\$72) |

Public Hearing and Official Ballot

Method of Voting

The enclosed official ballot will express your support or opposition to this proposed assessment. Property owners who own more than one property will receive separate ballots for each property.

To complete the enclosed ballot: mark the square next to either Yes or No, sign the ballot, fold it in half, place it in the provided return envelope, and mail to Fortuna Fire Protection District, PO Box 860, Fortuna, CA 95540. You may also hand deliver the ballot at the public hearing (see below for the time and location). Only official ballots which are signed and marked with the property owner's support or opposition will be counted. Ballots must be returned prior to the close of the public hearing on October 19, 2015 in order to be counted.

If you lose your ballot, require a replacement ballot, or want to change your vote, call the Fortuna Fire Protection District at (707) 725-5021 for another ballot. See the enclosed ballot for additional instructions. Ballots are weighted by the proposed amount of assessment and will be tabulated accordingly. The assessment will not be imposed if, upon the conclusion of the public hearing, weighted ballots submitted in opposition to the assessment exceed the weighted ballots submitted in favor of the assessment. If a majority of weighted ballots returned are in support, the assessment may be levied for fiscal year 2016-17 and may be continued in future years to fund fire protection, fire prevention, and emergency response services as directed by the Fire District Board.

Public Hearing

By law, at least 45 days must elapse between mailing of the ballots and the public hearing. A public hearing will be held on Monday, October 19, 2015, at 7:00 p.m. at the Fortuna Fire Main Station, 320 South Fortuna Boulevard, Fortuna, California. You are invited to attend the public hearing. Tabulation of the returned ballots will be conducted by an independent authority for all ballots received at the conclusion of the public hearing.



Cut along dotted line

FIRE ASSESSMENT BALLOT

Mail completed assessment ballot in enclosed return envelope to:
PO BOX 860, FORTUNA, CA 95540

Owner of Record: MUNICIPAL WATER CORP OF RIO DELL PL

Count Code: 5991

Parcel Number: 205-111-026-000

Use Code: 8000 (Vacant)

Units of Benefit: 1

Annual Cost: \$18.00

Ballot Question:

Shall the Board of Commissioners of the Fortuna Fire Protection District be empowered and authorized to establish an assessment for fire protection, fire prevention, and emergency response services for an amount not to exceed \$18.00 per unit of benefit? If passed, the assessment will supersede and replace the existing assessment.

☐

YES


☐

No

I hereby declare, under the penalty of perjury of the laws of California, that I am authorized to submit a ballot on behalf of the parcel identified above.

| | | | |
|---------------|--|-------|--|
| Signature: | | Date: | |
| Printed Name: | | | |

Please note, this is not a secret ballot. The law requires that each assessment ballot be signed by the record owner of the parcel.



SEP 03 2015

RECEIVED

15-5445***** 3-DIGIT 955
MUNICIPAL WATER CORP OF RIO DELL PL
ATTN: CITY HALL
675 WILDWOOD AVE
RIO DELL CA 95562-1597



"Always Ready, Always Willing"

est. 1904

For more information about the proposed assessment and this ballot:

Informational Community Meeting
Monday, September 14th at 5:30 p.m.

Public Hearing
Monday, October 19th at 7:00 p.m.

**Location for both the Community Meeting and the Public Hearing:
Fortuna Main Station (320 South Fortuna Blvd)**

Contacts: Lon Winburn, Fire Chief or Dave Nicholson, Board Commissioner
 (707) 725-5021 (707) 496-8686

www.fortunafire.com

*Rio Dell City Hall
675 Wildwood Avenue
Rio Dell, CA 95562
(707) 764-3532
riodellcity.com*



October 6, 2015

TO: Rio Dell City Council

FROM: Kyle Knopp, City Manager

SUBJECT: Discussion on Code Enforcement in Rio Dell

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE CITY COUNCIL:

No action recommended.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

The City Manager will provide a short talk on the current state of code enforcement in Rio Dell. Attached is a code enforcement rotation map dividing the city into ten zones with a 12 month rotation for active code enforcement.

///

*Rio Dell City Hall
675 Wildwood Avenue
Rio Dell, CA 95562
(707) 764-3532
riodellcity.com*



October 6, 2015

TO: Rio Dell City Council

FROM: Kyle Knopp, City Manager

SUBJECT: Authorize the City Manager to Investigate the Placement of a Fence Blocking Pedestrian River/Bridge Access at Eagle Prairie Bridge.


IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE CITY COUNCIL:

Authorize the City Manager to investigate the placement of a fence blocking pedestrian river/bridge access at Eagle Prairie Bridge.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

The City has received some complaints regarding overnight camping under the Eagle Prairie Bridge. The location in question is on the North end of the bridge on the west side, an attached map represents the location with a red X. Large amounts of trash, feces and other debris have been identified here. Staff would like Council authorization to begin looking into placing a fence at this location marked on the map, preferably via CalTrans who appear to possess the right-of-way. This would help block access to the area under the bridge, but also the river from this location. Staff will meet with CalTrans and other necessary partners to discuss options to have a fence placed at this location and staff will report back to the Council as more information becomes available.

///




Google earth


feet
meters



For Meeting of: October 6, 2015

To: City Council

From: Kevin Caldwell, Community Development Director 

Through: Kyle Knopp, City Manager 

Date: September 28, 2015

Subject: CDBG Supplemental Activity Request

Recommendation:

That the City Council:

1. Receive a brief staff report on making application with the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for approval of two Supplemental Activity applications for: (1) improvements to the access to City Hall and the Police Department (Removal of Architectural Barriers); and (2) an Owner Occupied Rehabilitation (OOR) loan for Diane Brown for foundation repairs at 158 Birch Street; and
2. Open the public hearing, receive public input, close the public hearing; and
3. Adopt Resolution No. 1272-2015 authorizing and directing the City Manager to make application to HCD for their approval of the Supplemental Activities.

Background and Discussion

As the Council likely remembers, the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) issued Management Memorandum 14-05 last year, notifying jurisdictions that a Program Income Reuse Agreement between the jurisdiction and HCD is required is required due to

Federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) changes to the Program Income reuse policy.

Based on direction from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and technical assistance from HUD contractors, the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) determined the State's rules on Program Income (PI) and Revolving Loan Accounts (RLA) were out of compliance with Community Development Block Grant federal statutes and regulations.

The policy and procedure changes were required to be made to resolve existing programmatic compliance issues related to the Community Development Block Grant Final Rule (effective May, 2012), and with the State's current Program Income and Revolving Loan Account rules.

The City was required to enter into a standard Community Development Block Grant Program Income Reuse Agreement. The approved Reuse Agreement limited the use of Program Income to housing assistance, which is the source of most if not all of the City's Program Income. At the time of the approval of the new Reuse Agreement, the City's Owner Occupied Rehabilitation program was the only CDBG approved activity. Since that time the City has adopted new Homebuyer Assistance Guidelines which were recently approved by the Department of Housing and Community Development. As such, Program Income was limited to the approved housing activities, the City's Owner Occupied and Homebuyer Assistance Programs.

As the Council is aware, the City recently met with Thomas Brandeberry in April, the Section Chief for the CDBG Program, to discuss the CDBG Program and how the City can best utilize the program to enhance the community. Based on that meeting, Mr. Brandeberry convinced staff and the Council that the Housing Revolving Loan Fund (RLF) is not in the best interest of the City, because it limits the use of our Program Income to Owner Occupied Rehabilitation and Homebuyer Assistance loans. If the Housing RLF were rescinded, the City could make application with HCD for any approved supplemental activities. A copy of

In May of this year, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 1259-2015 authorizing the City Manager to request that the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) rescind their approval of the City's Program Income Housing Revolving Loan Fund. Staff was recently informed that the Housing RLF had been rescinded.

As such, the City is now required to make Supplemental Activity applications for other approved CDBG activities. See Attachment 1 for CDBG eligible activities.

Attachments 2 and 3 include two Supplemental Activity applications for: (1) improvements to the access to City Hall and the Police Department (Removal of Architectural Barriers); and (2) an Owner Occupied Rehabilitation (OOR) loan for Diane Brown for foundation repairs at 158 Birch Street.

Attachment 4 is Resolution No. 1272-2015 authorizing the City Manager to make application for the Supplemental Activities to the Department of Housing and Community Development.

Attachments

Attachment 1: IDIS Matrix of CDBG Eligible Activities.

Attachment 2: Supplemental Activity application for improvements to the access to City Hall and the Police Department (Removal of Architectural Barriers).

Attachment 3: Supplemental Activity application for an Owner Occupied Rehabilitation (OOR) loan for Diane Brown for foundation repairs at 158 Birch Street.

Attachment 4: Resolution No. 1272-2015 authorizing the City Manager to make application for the Supplemental Activities to the Department of Housing and Community Development.

IDIS Matrix - CDBG Eligibility Activity Codes and National Objectives

APPENDIX G

| Matrix Codes Key | | National Objective Codes (N=Not Allowed) | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|--|--|-----|-------|-----|-----|-------|------|-----|-----|
| Code | Eligible Activity | LMA | LMC | LMCMC | LMH | LMJ | LMJFI | LMJP | SBA | SBS |
| 1 | Acquisition of Real Property (for development) | | | N | | | N | | | |
| 03 | Other Public Facilities & Improvement to Public Facilities | | | N | | | | | | |
| 03A | Senior Center | N | | N | N | | | | | |
| 03B | Handicapped Center | N | | N | N | | | | | |
| 03C | Homeless Facilities (not operating cost) | N | | N | N | | | | | |
| 03D | Youth Centers | N | | N | N | | | | | |
| 03E | Neighborhood Facilities | | | N | N | | | | | |
| 03F | Parks, Recreational Facilities | | | N | N | N | | N | | |
| 03G | Parking Facilities | | | N | N | | | | | |
| 03H | Solid Waste Disposal Improvements | | | N | | | | | | |
| 03I | Flood Drainage Improvements | | | N | | | | | | |
| 03J | Water/Sewer Improvement | | | N | | | | | | |
| 03K | Street Improvements | | | N | | | | | | |
| 03L | Sidewalks | | | N | | | | | | |
| 03M | Child Care Center | N | | N | N | | | | | |
| 03N | Tree Planting | | | N | | | | | | |
| 03O | Fire Station/Equipment | | N | N | N | N | | N | | |
| 03P | Health Facilities | | | N | N | | | | | |
| 03Q | Abused and Neglected Children Facilities | N | | N | N | | | | | |
| 03R | Asbestos Removal | | | N | N | | | | | |
| 03S | Facilities to AIDS Patients (no operating cost) | N | | N | N | | | | | |
| 4 | Clearance, Demo, Remediation | | | N | | | N | | | |
| 04A | Cleanup of Contaminated Sites | | | N | | | N | | | |
| 05 | Other Public Services | | | N | N | N | N | N | | N |
| 03T | Operating Cost Homeless/AIDS Patients | N | | N | N | N | N | N | | N |
| 05A | Senior Services | N | | N | N | N | N | N | | N |
| 05B | Handicapped Services | N | | N | N | N | N | N | | N |
| 05C | Legal Services | | | N | N | N | N | N | | N |
| 05D | Youth Services | N | | N | N | N | N | N | | N |
| 05E | Transportation Services | | | N | N | N | N | N | | N |
| 05F | Substance Abuse Services | | | N | N | N | N | N | | N |
| 05G | Battered and Abused Spouses | N | | N | N | N | N | N | | N |
| 05H | Employment Training | | | N | N | N | N | N | | N |
| 05I | Crime Awareness | | | N | N | N | N | N | | N |
| 05J | Fair Housing Activities-SUBJ. to Pub Ser. Cap | | | N | N | N | N | N | | N |
| 05K | Tenant/Landlord Counseling | N | | N | N | N | N | N | | N |
| 05L | Child Care Services | N | | N | N | N | N | N | | N |
| 05M | Health Services | | | N | N | N | N | N | | N |
| 05N | Abused and Neglected Children | N | | N | N | N | N | N | | N |
| 05O | Mental Health Services | | | N | N | N | N | N | | N |
| 05P | Screening for Lead Based Paint/Lead Hazards | N | | N | N | N | N | N | | N |
| 05Q | Subsistence Payments | N | | N | N | N | N | N | | N |
| 05T | Security Deposits | N | N | N | | N | N | N | | N |
| 05U | Housing Counseling | N | N | N | | N | N | N | N | N |
| 05V | Neighborhood Cleanups | | N | N | N | N | N | N | | N |
| 05W | Food Banks | | | N | N | N | N | N | | N |
| 13 | Homeownership Direct Assistance | N | N | N | | N | N | N | N | N |
| 14A | Rehab, Single-Unit Residence | N | N | N | | N | N | N | | |
| 14B | Rehab, Multi-Unit Residential | N | N | N | | N | N | N | | |
| 14C | Public Housing Modernization | N | N | N | | N | N | N | | |
| 14D | Rehab, Other than Public-Owned Residential Bids | N | N | N | | N | N | N | | |
| 14E | Rehab, Pub./Private-Owned Commercial/Industrial | | | N | N | | N | | | |
| 14F | Energy Efficiency Improvements | N | N | N | | N | N | N | | |
| 14G | Acquisition for Rehabilitation | N | N | N | | N | N | N | | |
| 14H | Rehabilitation Administration | | | N | | | N | | | |
| 14I | Lead Base Paint/Hazards Test/Abatement | N | N | N | | N | N | N | | |
| 15 | Code Enforcement (public Service) | | N | N | N | N | N | N | | N |
| 16A | Residential Historic Preservation | N | N | N | | N | N | N | | |
| 16B | Non-Residential Historic Preservation | | | N | N | | N | | | |

IDIS Matrix - CDBG Eligibility Activity Codes and National Objectives (continued)

| Matrix Codes Key | | National Objective Codes (N=Not Allowed) | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17B | C/I infrastructure Development | | | N | N | | | | | | N |
| 17C | C/I Building Acq., Construction, Rehabilitation | | | N | N | | N | | | | |
| 17D | Other Commercial/Industrial Improvement | | | N | N | | N | | | | |
| 18A | ED Assistance to For Profits | | N | N | N | | N | | | | N |
| 18C | Microenterprise Assistance | | | | N | | N | | | | N |
| 20A | State Planning (PTA) | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N |
| 21A | Gen. Program Admin. | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N |

| National Objective Key | | Federal Regulations for States |
|------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| LMA | Low- and moderate-income (Low/Mod) Area Benefit | 570.483(b)(1) |
| LMC | Low/Mod Limited Clientele | 570.483(b)(2) |
| LMCMC | Low/Mod Limited Clientele Microenterprise Development | 570.483(b)(2)(iv) |
| LMCSV | Low/Mod Limited Clientele, Job Services Benefit | 570.483(b)(2)(v) |
| LMH | Low/Mod Housing | 570.483(b)(3) |
| LMJ | Low/Mod Job Creation For Retention | 570.483(b)(4) |
| LMJFI | Low/Mod Creation or Retention, Public Facility/Improvement | 570.483(b)(4)(vi)(F) |
| LMJP | Low/Mod Creation or Retention, Location Based | 570.483(b)(4)(iv)(B) |
| SBA | Slum and Blight Area | 570.483(c)(1) |
| SBS | Slum and Blight Spot | 570.483(c)(2) |

Updated 12/2014

Matrix Code Definitions

Matrix codes are used to indicate—but do not establish—activity eligibility. An activity must be eligible in accordance with Section 105(a) of The Act [42 USC 5305]. Grantees need to refer to the regulations at 24 CFR 570-Subpart I to determine an activity's eligibility; the codes defined below are used in IDIS Online chiefly to categorize activities for reporting purposes.

| Code | Definition |
|------|--|
| 01 | <p>Acquisition of Real Property</p> <p>Acquisition of real property that will be developed for a public purpose. Use code 01 for the CDBG-funded purchase of real property on which, for example, a public facility or housing will be constructed.</p> <p><i>When CDBG funds are used to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>acquire a public facility that will be rehabilitated with CDBG funds and continue to be used as a public facility, assign the appropriate 03* code.</i> • <i>acquire housing that will be rehabilitated, use code 14G.</i> |
| 03 | <p>Other Public Facilities and Improvements</p> <p>Do not use this code unless an activity does not fall under a more specific 03* code. Also, do not use one activity for multiple facilities and then assign it an 03 because the types of facilities are different.</p> <p>Use of this code require prior approval from the Department</p> <p>One legitimate use of 03 is for activities that assist persons with disabilities by removing architectural barriers from or providing ADA improvements to government buildings (activities that otherwise would not be eligible for CDBG funding).</p> |
| 03A | <p>Senior Centers</p> <p>Acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation of facilities (except permanent housing) for seniors. 03A may be used for a facility serving both the elderly and the handicapped provided it is not intended primarily to serve persons with handicaps. If it is, use 03B instead.</p> <p><i>For the construction of permanent housing for the elderly, use code 12; for the rehabilitation of such housing, use the appropriate 14* code.</i></p> |
| 03B | <p>Handicapped Centers</p> <p>Acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation of centers, group homes, and other facilities (except permanent housing) for the handicapped.</p> <p>03B may be used for a facility serving both the handicapped and the elderly provided it is not intended primarily to serve the elderly. If it is, use 03A instead.</p> <p><i>For the construction of permanent housing for the handicapped, use code 12; for the rehabilitation of such housing, use the appropriate 14* code.</i></p> |
| 03C | <p>Homeless Facilities (not operating costs)</p> <p>Acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation of temporary shelters and transitional housing for the homeless, including battered spouses, disaster victims, runaway children, drug offenders, and parolees.</p> <p><i>For the construction of permanent housing for the homeless, use code 12; for the rehabilitation of such housing, use the appropriate 14* code.</i></p> |
| 03D | <p>Youth Centers</p> <p>Acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation of facilities intended primarily for young people age 13 to 19. These include playground and recreational facilities that are part of a youth center.</p> <p><i>For the acquisition, construction or rehabilitation of facilities intended primarily for children age 12 and under, use 03M; for facilities for abused and neglected children, use 03Q.</i></p> |
| 03E | <p>Neighborhood Facilities</p> <p>Acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation of facilities that are principally designed to serve a neighborhood and that will be used for social services or for multiple purposes (including recreation). Such facilities may include libraries and community centers.</p> |
| 03F | <p>Parks, Recreational Facilities</p> <p>Development of open space areas or facilities intended primarily for recreational use.</p> |

Matrix Code Definitions

| Code | Definition |
|------|--|
| 03G | <p>Parking Facilities Acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation of parking lots and parking garages. Also use 03G if the primary purpose of rehabilitating a public facility or carrying out a street improvement activity is to improve parking.</p> <p><i>If parking improvements are only part of a larger street improvement activity, use 03K.</i></p> |
| 03H | <p>Solid Waste Disposal Improvements Acquisition, construction or rehabilitation of solid waste disposal facilities.</p> |
| 03I | <p>Flood Drainage Improvements Acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation of flood drainage facilities, such as retention ponds or catch basins. Do not use 03I for construction/rehabilitation of storm sewers, street drains, or storm drains.</p> <p><i>Use 03J for storm sewers and 03K for street and storm drains.</i></p> |
| 03J | <p>Water/Sewer Improvements Installation or replacement of water lines, sanitary sewers, storm sewers, and fire hydrants. Costs of street repairs (usually repaving) made necessary by water/sewer improvement activities are included under 03J.</p> <p><i>For water/sewer improvements that are part of:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>more extensive street improvements, use 03K (assign 03K, for example, to an activity that involves paving six blocks of Main Street and installing 100 feet of new water lines in one of those blocks).</i> <i>a housing rehabilitation activity, use the appropriate 14* matrix code.</i> <p><i>For construction or rehabilitation of flood drainage facilities, use 03I.</i></p> |
| 03K | <p>Street Improvements Installation or repair of streets, street drains, storm drains, curbs and gutters, tunnels, bridges, and traffic lights/signs. Also use 03K:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> for improvements that include landscaping, street lighting, and/or street signs (commonly referred to as "streetscaping"). <p><i>For sidewalk improvements, use 03L.</i></p> |
| 03L | <p>Sidewalks Improvements to sidewalks. Also use 03L for sidewalk improvements that include the installation of trash receptacles, lighting, benches, and trees.</p> |
| 03M | <p>Child Care Centers Acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation of facilities intended primarily for children age 12 and under. Examples are daycare centers and Head Start preschool centers.</p> <p><i>For the construction or rehabilitation of facilities for abused and neglected children, use 03Q; for the construction or rehabilitation of facilities for teenagers, use 03D.</i></p> |
| 03N | <p>Tree Planting Activities limited to tree planting (sometimes referred to as "beautification").</p> <p><i>For streetscape activities that include tree planting, use 03K; for sidewalk improvement activities that include tree planting, use 03L.</i></p> |
| 03O | <p>Fire Stations/Equipment Acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation of fire stations and/or the purchase of fire trucks and emergency rescue equipment.</p> |

Matrix Code Definitions

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

Matrix Code Definitions

| Code | Definition |
|------|---|
| 03P | Health Facilities Acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation of physical or mental health facilities. Examples of such facilities include neighborhood clinics, hospitals, nursing homes, and convalescent homes. <i>Health facilities for a specific client group should use the matrix code for that client group. For example, use 03Q for the construction or rehabilitation of health facilities for abused and neglected children.</i> |
| 03Q | Facilities for Abused and Neglected Children Acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation of daycare centers, treatment facilities, or temporary housing for abused and neglected children. |
| 03R | Asbestos Removal Rehabilitation of any public facility undertaken primarily to remove asbestos. |
| 03S | Facilities for AIDS Patients (not operating costs) Acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation of facilities for the treatment or temporary housing of people who are HIV positive or who have AIDS. <i>For the construction or rehabilitation of facilities for AIDS education and prevention, use 03P.</i> |
| 03T | This activity description is actually a Public Service, see the box following 05 Public Service description |
| 04 | Clearance and Demolition Clearance or demolition of buildings/improvements, or the movement of buildings to other sites. |
| 04A | Cleanup of Contaminated Sites Activities undertaken primarily to clean toxic/environmental waste or contamination from a site. |
| 05 | Other Public Services Do not use this code for public services activities unless an activity does not fall under a more specific 05* code. Use of this code requires prior approval from the Department. An example of a legitimate use of this code is referrals to social services. |
| 03T | Operating Costs of Homeless/AIDS Patients Programs Costs associated with the operation of programs for the homeless or for AIDS patients, such as staff costs, utilities, maintenance, and insurance. Because payment of operating costs for these programs is a public service under CDBG, all CDBG expenditures for 03T activities are included in the calculation of the Public Services cap. |
| 05A | Senior Services Services for the elderly. 05A may be used for an activity that serves both the elderly and the handicapped provided it is not intended primarily to serve persons with handicaps. If it is, use 05B instead. |
| 05B | Handicapped Services Services for the handicapped, regardless of age. |
| 05C | Legal Services Services providing legal aid to low- and moderate-income (LMI) persons. <i>If the only legal service provided is for the settlement of tenant/landlord disputes, use 05K.</i> |
| 05D | Youth Services Services for young people age 13 to 19 that include, for example, recreational services limited to teenagers and teen counseling programs. Also use 05D for counseling programs that target teens but include counseling for the family as well. <i>For services for children age 12 and under, use 05L; for services for abused and neglected children, use 05N.</i> |

Matrix Code Definitions

| Code | Definition |
|------|--|
| 05E | Transportation Services General transportation services. <i>Transportation services for a specific client group should use the matrix code for that client group. For example, use 05A for transportation services for the elderly.</i> |
| 05F | Substance Abuse Services Substance abuse recovery programs and substance abuse prevention/education activities. If the services are provided for a specific client group, the matrix code for that client group may be used instead. For example, substance abuse services that target teenagers may be coded either 05D or 05F. |
| 05G | Services for Battered and Abused Spouses Services for battered and abused spouses and their families. <i>For services limited to abused and neglected children, use 05N.</i> |
| 05H | Employment Training Assistance to increase self-sufficiency, including literacy, independent living skills, and job training. <i>For activities providing training for permanent jobs with specific businesses, use 18A.</i> |
| 05I | Crime Awareness/Prevention Promotion of crime awareness and prevention, including crime prevention education programs and paying for security guards. |
| 05J | Fair Housing Activities (subject to Public Services cap) Fair housing services (e.g. counseling on housing discrimination) that meet a national objective. <i>For fair housing services activities carried out as part of general program administration (and thus not required to meet a national objective), use 21D.</i> |
| 05K | Tenant/Landlord Counseling Counseling to help prevent or settle disputes between tenants and landlords. |
| 05L | Child Care Services Services that will benefit children (generally under age 13), including parenting skills classes. <i>For services exclusively for abused and neglected children, use 05N.</i> |
| 05M | Health Services Services addressing the physical health needs of residents of the community. <i>For mental health services, use 05O.</i> |
| 05N | Services for Abused and Neglected Children Daycare and other services exclusively for abused and neglected children. |
| 05O | Mental Health Services Services addressing the mental health needs of residents of the community. |
| 05P | Screening for Lead Poisoning Activities undertaken primarily to provide screening for lead poisoning. <i>For lead poisoning testing/abatement activities, use 14I.</i> |
| 05Q | Subsistence Payments One-time or short-term (no more than three months) emergency payments on behalf of individuals or families, generally for the purpose of preventing homelessness. Examples include utility payments to prevent cutoff of service and rent/mortgage payments to prevent eviction. |

Matrix Code Definitions

| Matrix Code | Definition |
|-------------|------------|
| 1 | ... |
| 2 | ... |
| 3 | ... |
| 4 | ... |
| 5 | ... |
| 6 | ... |
| 7 | ... |
| 8 | ... |
| 9 | ... |
| 10 | ... |
| 11 | ... |
| 12 | ... |
| 13 | ... |
| 14 | ... |
| 15 | ... |
| 16 | ... |
| 17 | ... |
| 18 | ... |
| 19 | ... |
| 20 | ... |
| 21 | ... |
| 22 | ... |
| 23 | ... |
| 24 | ... |
| 25 | ... |
| 26 | ... |
| 27 | ... |
| 28 | ... |
| 29 | ... |
| 30 | ... |
| 31 | ... |
| 32 | ... |
| 33 | ... |
| 34 | ... |
| 35 | ... |
| 36 | ... |
| 37 | ... |
| 38 | ... |
| 39 | ... |
| 40 | ... |
| 41 | ... |
| 42 | ... |
| 43 | ... |
| 44 | ... |
| 45 | ... |
| 46 | ... |
| 47 | ... |
| 48 | ... |
| 49 | ... |
| 50 | ... |
| 51 | ... |
| 52 | ... |
| 53 | ... |
| 54 | ... |
| 55 | ... |
| 56 | ... |
| 57 | ... |
| 58 | ... |
| 59 | ... |
| 60 | ... |
| 61 | ... |
| 62 | ... |
| 63 | ... |
| 64 | ... |
| 65 | ... |
| 66 | ... |
| 67 | ... |
| 68 | ... |
| 69 | ... |
| 70 | ... |
| 71 | ... |
| 72 | ... |
| 73 | ... |
| 74 | ... |
| 75 | ... |
| 76 | ... |
| 77 | ... |
| 78 | ... |
| 79 | ... |
| 80 | ... |
| 81 | ... |
| 82 | ... |
| 83 | ... |
| 84 | ... |
| 85 | ... |
| 86 | ... |
| 87 | ... |
| 88 | ... |
| 89 | ... |
| 90 | ... |
| 91 | ... |
| 92 | ... |
| 93 | ... |
| 94 | ... |
| 95 | ... |
| 96 | ... |
| 97 | ... |
| 98 | ... |
| 99 | ... |

Matrix Code Definitions

| Code | Definition |
|------|---|
| 05T | Security Deposits Tenant subsidies exclusively for payment of security deposits. |
| 05U | Housing Counseling Housing counseling for renters, homeowners, and/or potential new homebuyers that is provided as an independent public service (i.e., not as part of another eligible housing activity). |
| 05V | Neighborhood Cleanups One-time or short-term efforts to remove trash and debris from neighborhoods. Examples of legitimate uses of this code include neighborhood cleanup campaigns and graffiti removal. |
| 05W | Food Banks Costs associated with the operation of food banks, community kitchens, and food pantries, such as staff costs, supplies, utilities, maintenance, and insurance. |
| 13 | Direct Homeownership Assistance Homeownership assistance to LMI households as authorized under 105(a)(24). Forms of assistance include subsidizing interest rates and mortgage principal, paying up to 50% of down payment costs, paying reasonable closing costs, acquiring guarantees for mortgage financing from private lenders, and financing the acquisition by LMI households of the housing they already occupy. If housing counseling is provided to households receiving direct homeownership assistance, the counseling is considered part of the code 13 activity. All recipients of assistance provided under matrix code 13 must be LMI. |
| 14A | Rehab: Single-Unit Residential Rehabilitation of privately owned, single-unit homes. |
| 14B | Rehab: Multi-Unit Residential Rehabilitation of privately owned buildings with two or more permanent residential units. <i>For the rehabilitation of units that will provide temporary shelter or transitional housing for the homeless, use 03C.</i> |
| 14C | Rehab: Public Housing Modernization Rehabilitation of housing units owned/operated by a public housing authority (PHA). |
| 14D | Rehab: Other Publicly Owned Residential Buildings Rehabilitation of permanent housing owned by a public entity other than a PHA. <i>For the rehabilitation of other publicly owned buildings that will provide temporary shelter or transitional housing for the homeless, use 03C.</i> |

Matrix Code Definitions

| Code | Definition |
|------|---|
| 14E | <p>Rehab: Publicly or Privately Owned Commercial/Industrial Rehabilitation of commercial/industrial property. If the property is privately owned, CDBG-funded rehab is limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exterior improvements (generally referred to as "facade improvements"). • Correction of code violations <p><i>For more extensive rehabilitation of privately owned commercial/industrial property, use 17C; for infrastructure developments and improvements at commercial/industrial sites, use 17B.</i></p> |
| 14F | <p>Rehab: Energy Efficiency Improvements Housing rehabilitation with the sole purpose of improving energy efficiency (e.g., a weatherization program).</p> <p><i>For energy efficiency improvements to public housing units, use 14C; for other publicly owned residential buildings, use 14D.</i></p> |
| 14G | <p>Rehab: Acquisition Acquisition of property to be rehabilitated for housing. 14G may be used whether CDBG funds will pay only for acquisition or for both acquisition and rehabilitation.</p> |
| 14H | <p>Rehab: Administration All delivery costs (including staff, other direct costs, and service costs) directly related to carrying out housing rehabilitation activities. Examples include appraisal, architectural, engineering, and other professional services; preparation of work specifications and work write-ups; loan processing; survey, site and utility plans; application processing; and other fees.</p> <p>Do not use 14H for the costs of actual rehabilitation and do not use it for costs unrelated to running a rehab program (e.g., tenant/landlord counseling).</p> <p><i>For housing rehabilitation administration activities carried out as part of general program administration (and thus not required to meet a national objective), use code 21.</i></p> |
| 14I | <p>Lead-Based Paint/Lead Hazards Testing/Abatement Housing rehabilitation activities with the primary goal of evaluating and reducing lead-based paint/lead hazards.</p> <p><i>For lead-based paint/lead hazards screening, use OSP.</i></p> |
| 15 | <p>Code Enforcement Salaries and overhead costs associated with property inspections and follow-up actions (such as legal proceedings) directly related to the enforcement (not correction) of state and local codes.</p> <p><i>For the correction of code violations, use the appropriate rehabilitation code.</i></p> |
| 16A | <p>Residential Historic Preservation Rehabilitation of historic buildings for residential use.</p> |
| 16B | <p>Non-Residential Historic Preservation Rehabilitation of historic buildings for non-residential use. Examples include the renovation of an historic building for use as a neighborhood facility, as a museum, or by an historic preservation society.</p> |
| 17B | <p>Commercial/Industrial: Infrastructure Development Street, water, parking, rail transport, or other improvements to commercial/industrial sites. 17B also includes the installation of public improvements, such as the construction of streets to and through commercial/industrial areas. 17B activities must be carried out by the grantee or by non-profits.</p> |
| 17C | <p>Commercial/Industrial: Building Acquisition, Construction, Rehabilitation Acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation of commercial/industrial buildings. 17C activities must be carried out by the grantee or by non-profits.</p> |

Matrix Code Definitions

| Code | Definition |
|------|--|
| 17D | Commercial/Industrial: Other Improvements Commercial/Industrial improvements not covered by other 17* codes. 17D activities must be carried out by the grantee or by non-profits. |
| 18A | Economic Development: Direct Financial Assistance to For-Profits Financial assistance to for-profit businesses to (for example) acquire property, clear structures, build, expand or rehabilitate a building, purchase equipment, or provide operating capital. Forms of assistance include loans, loan guarantees, and grants. |
| 18C | Economic Development: Microenterprise Assistance Financial assistance, technical assistance, or general support services to owners and developers of micro-enterprises. A micro-enterprise is a business with five or fewer employees, including the owner(s). |
| 20A | State Planning (PTA) Program planning activities for when states award grants to units of general local government in which planning is the only activity, or in which planning activities are unrelated to any other activity funded as part of the grant. These are often referred to as "planning only grants" or "planning-only activities." |
| 21A | General Program Administration Overall program administration, including (but not limited to) salaries, wages, and related costs of grantee staff or others engaged in program management, monitoring, and evaluation. Also use 21A to report the use of CDBG funds to administer federally-designated Empowerment Zones or Enterprise Communities. |

National Objective Code Definitions

| Code | Description |
|--------------|---|
| LMA | Low/mod area benefit Activities providing benefits that are available to all the residents of a particular area, at least 51% of whom are low/mod income. The service area of an LMA activity is identified by the grantee, and need not coincide with Census tracts or other officially recognized boundaries. |
| LMC | Low/mod limited clientele benefit Activities that benefit a limited clientele, at least 51% of whom are low/mod income. LMC activities provide benefits to a specific group of persons rather than to all the residents of a particular area. |
| LMCMC | Low/mod limited clientele, micro-enterprises Activities carried out under 24 CFR 570.483(b)(2)(iv) that benefit micro-enterprise owners/developers who are low/mod income. |
| LMH | Low/mod housing benefit Activities undertaken to provide or improve permanent residential structures that will be occupied by low/mod income households. |
| LMJ | Low/mod job creation and retention Activities undertaken to create or retain permanent jobs, at least 51% of which will be made available to or held by low/mod persons. |
| LMJFI | Low/mod job creation and retention, public facility/ improvement benefit Public facility/improvement activities that are undertaken principally for the benefit of one or more businesses and that result in the creation/retention of jobs. |
| LMJP | Low/mod job creation, location-based Activities where a job is held by or made available to a low/mod person based on the location of the person's residence or the location of the assisted business. |
| SBA | Slum/blight area benefit Activities undertaken to prevent or eliminate slums or blight in a designated area. |
| SBS | Slum/blight, spot basis Activities undertaken on a spot basis to address conditions of blight or physical decay not located in designated slum/blight areas. |

CDBG SUPPLEMENTAL ACTIVITY REQUEST - PROJECT -



| | | |
|---|--|--|
| GRANTEE: <u>City of Rio Dell</u> | CONTACT PERSON: <u>Kevin Caldwell</u> | PHONE: <u>(707) 764-3532</u> EMAIL: <u>kcaldwell@riodelcity.com</u> |
| DATE SUBMITTED BY JURISDICTION: <u>October 7, 2015</u> | CDBG REPRESENTATIVE: <u>Max Emami</u> | |

1. INDICATE CDBG ACTIVITY and MATRIX CODE TO BE FUNDED AS A SUPPLEMENTAL ACTIVITY::

Activity: Removal of architectural barriers at City Hall
☐ **ED PROJECT**
Matrix Code: 03

☒ **CD PROJECT**

Contract(s) this activity is to be added to: _____

2. INDICATE PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES:

- A. TOTAL PROJECT COST:** \$ Unknown at this time. The City will prepare an RFQ for design/engineering services, then prepare an RFP for the construction.
- B. TOTAL CDBG FUNDS NEEDED:** \$ Unknown at this time. The City intends on utilizing Program Income (PI).
- C. TOTAL NON-CDBG FUNDING COMMITTED:** \$0
Sources of Other Committed Funding: *(Indicate each funding source.)*
 (i) N/A
 (ii) N/A
- D. TOTAL OTHER FUNDING NEEDED (is there a gap?):** \$ 0

Comments: _____

3. ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION: (Be sure to fully answer A. and B. below.)

- A. INDICATE ADDRESS OR LOCATION (IF INFRASTRUCTURE) OF PROJECT:**
City Hall
675 Wildwood Avenue
Rio Dell, CA. 95562
- B. PROPOSED PROJECT: (Aggregated Scope of Work for entire project.)**
Design and construction of a ADA compliant ramp into to City Hall including the Police Department. The Project will include the removal of the existing ramp and stairs to City Hall.
- C. SCOPE OF WORK FOR CDBG FUNDING:**
Entire project including design and construction and removal of existing ramp and stairways.
- D. TIMELINE OF PROPOSED PROJECT:**
Approximately six (6) months from RFQ to completion.

CDBG SUPPLEMENTAL ACTIVITY REQUEST

- PROJECT -

Page | 2

JURISDICTION: City of Rio Dell

4. ELIGIBILITY:

A. NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:

- 1) ☒ Low/Moderate Area (LMA)
- 2) ☐ Low/Mod Housing (LMH)
- 3) ☐ Low/Mod Clientele (LMC)

B. HUD LOW/MOD BENEFIT:

National Objective must be met by either:

- 1) Beneficiaries meeting income restriction;
- 2) Beneficiaries being members of a Limited Clientele; or,
- 3) Service area being primarily Low/Mod individuals (>51%).

Check the box that describes how this Project will meet the National Objective, and describe the details requested.

☒ Area Benefit:

Low/Mod %: 60.3

☐ Based on HUD Low/Mod Data

☒ Based on Income Survey

(Prior Department approval is required for submission of this form)

☒ Jurisdiction-Wide ☐ Service Area

☐ Income Restricted (Public Improvements in Support of Housing Only)

☐ Limited Clientele: (Public Facility Only)

List Type(s) of Limited Clientele: _____

Explain Benefit in Activity: Removing existing ADA architectural barriers to the entrance of City Hall.

C. DESCRIPTION OF SERVICE AREA:

Submit Map(s) and Identify:

- (1) Census Tract/ Block Group; and,
- (2) Zoning in description

☒ Entire Jurisdiction

☐ Service Area(s):

Describe Service Area of Project: _____

Map must be included

Note: Service area information is needed regardless of which Low/Mod benefit is being used.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION:

No CDBG Project can be approved without the required Citizen Participation being completed.

Indicate the status of each of the following:

Public Notice: ☒ Completed ☐ Not Completed Comments: _____

Resolution of the Governing Body (Authorizing submittal of Supplemental Request, designating the Authorized Representative)

☒ Completed ☐ Not Completed Comments: _____

Please submit evidence of the above with this request.

CDBG SUPPLEMENTAL ACTIVITY REQUEST

- PROJECT -

Page | 3

On behalf of the City/County of: Rio Dell I submit this CDBG Supplemental Activity Request and understand that, upon approval, this activity will be amended into an open CDBG contract and all conditions of that contract will be applicable, including the need to clear General Condition before incurring costs.

Authorized Representative Signature: _____

Date: October 7, 2015

Print Name and Title of Authorized Signer:

Kyle Knopp, City Manager

Print Name of Preparer: Kevin Caldwell Date: October 7, 2015

Additional Comments: _____

(FOR USE BY CDBG PROGRAM ONLY)

JURISDICTION: _____

6. ACTIVITY APPROVAL:

☐ APPROVED

☐ APPROVED WITH SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

Activity Eligibility 105(a): _____

☐ NOT APPROVED Date: _____

7. REASONS FOR NOT APPROVING:

CDBG Representative: _____ Date: _____

CDBG Program Manager: _____ Date: _____

CDBG Section Chief: _____ Date: _____

CDBG SUPPLEMENTAL ACTIVITY REQUEST - PROJECT -



GRANTEE: City of Rio Dell

CONTACT PERSON: Kevin Caldwell

PHONE: (707) 764-3532

EMAIL:
kcaldwell@riodellicity.com

DATE SUBMITTED BY JURISDICTION: October 7, 2015

CDBG REPRESENTATIVE: Max Emami

1. INDICATE CDBG ACTIVITY and MATRIX CODE TO BE FUNDED AS A SUPPLEMENTAL ACTIVITY::

Activity: Owner Occupied Rehabilitation Loan
Matrix Code: 14A

☒ **CD PROJECT**

☐ **ED PROJECT**

Contract(s) this activity is to be added to: _____

2. INDICATE PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES:

A. TOTAL PROJECT COST: \$ Unknown at this time. However, it is expected to be between \$10,000 and \$15,000.

B. TOTAL CDBG FUNDS NEEDED: \$ Between \$10,000 and \$15,000. The City intends on utilizing Housing Program Income (PI).

C. TOTAL NON-CDBG FUNDING COMMITTED: \$ 0
Sources of Other Committed Funding: *(Indicate each funding source.)*

(i) N/A

(ii) N/A

D. TOTAL OTHER FUNDING NEEDED (is there a gap?): \$ 0

Comments: _____

3. ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION: (Be sure to fully answer A. and B. below.)

A. INDICATE ADDRESS OR LOCATION (IF INFRASTRUCTURE) OF PROJECT:

158 Birch Street
Rio Dell, CA. 95562

B. PROPOSED PROJECT: (Aggregated Scope of Work for entire project.)

Foundation repair to an existing owner occupied single family residence.

C. SCOPE OF WORK FOR CDBG FUNDING:

Repair existing foundation, including new perimeter foundation and girders where needed.

D. TIMELINE OF PROPOSED PROJECT:

It's expected that the improvements can be completed within one (1) month once a contractor has been selected.

CDBG SUPPLEMENTAL ACTIVITY REQUEST

- PROJECT -

Page | 2

JURISDICTION: City of Rio Dell

4. ELIGIBILITY:

A. NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:

- 1) ☐ Low/Moderate Area (LMA)
- 2) ☐ Low/Mod Housing (LMH)
- 3) ☒ Low/Mod Clientele (LMC)

B. HUD LOW/MOD BENEFIT:

National Objective must be met by either:

- 1) Beneficiaries meeting income restriction;
- 2) Beneficiaries being members of a Limited Clientele; or,
- 3) Service area being primarily Low/Mod individuals (>51%).

Check the box that describes how this Project will meet the National Objective, and describe the details requested.

☐ Area Benefit:

Low/Mod %:

- ☐ Based on HUD Low/Mod Data
- ☐ Based on Income Survey

(Prior Department approval is required for submission of this form)

☐ Jurisdiction-Wide ☐ Service Area

☐ Income Restricted (*Public Improvements in Support of Housing Only*)

☐ Limited Clientele: (*Public Facility Only*)

List Type(s) of Limited Clientele: _____

Explain Benefit in Activity: Property owner meets LMI restriction.

C. DESCRIPTION OF SERVICE AREA:

Submit Map(s) and Identify:

- (1) Census Tract/ Block Group; and,
- (2) Zoning in description

Note: Service area information is needed regardless of which Low/Mod benefit is being used.

☐ Entire Jurisdiction

☒ Service Area(s):

Describe Service Area of Project: Single family residence, 158 Birch Avenue, Rio Dell.

Map must be included

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION:

No CDBG Project can be approved without the required Citizen Participation being completed.

Indicate the status of each of the following:

Public Notice: ☒ Completed ☐ Not Completed Comments: _____

Resolution of the Governing Body (Authorizing submittal of Supplemental Request, designating the Authorized Representative)

☒ Completed ☐ Not Completed Comments: _____

Please submit evidence of the above with this request.

CDBG SUPPLEMENTAL ACTIVITY REQUEST

- PROJECT -

Page | 3

On behalf of the City/County of: Rio Dell I submit this CDBG Supplemental Activity Request and understand that, upon approval, this activity will be amended into an open CDBG contract and all conditions of that contract will be applicable, including the need to clear General Condition before incurring costs.

Authorized Representative Signature: _____

Date: October 7, 2015

Print Name and Title of Authorized Signer:

Kyle Knopp, City Manager

Print Name of Preparer: Kevin Caldwell Date: October 7, 2015

Additional Comments: _____

(FOR USE BY CDBG PROGRAM ONLY)

JURISDICTION: _____

6. ACTIVITY APPROVAL:

☐ **APPROVED**

☐ **APPROVED WITH SPECIAL CONDITIONS:**

Activity Eligibility 105(a): _____

☐ **NOT APPROVED** Date: _____

7. REASONS FOR NOT APPROVING:

CDBG Representative: _____

Date: _____

CDBG Program Manager: _____

Date: _____

CDBG Section Chief: _____

Date: _____

RESOLUTION NO. 1272-2015



**RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RIO DELL
AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO MAKE TWO SUPPLEMENTAL ACTIVITY
APPLICATIONS FOR: (1) IMPROVEMENTS TO THE ACCESS TO CITY HALL AND THE
POLICE DEPARTMENT (REMOVAL OF ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS); AND (2) AN
OWNER OCCUPIED REHABILITATION (OOR) LOAN FOR DIANE BROWN FOR
FOUNDATION REPAIRS AT 158 BIRCH STREET**

WHEREAS at the City Council meeting of November 18, 2014 the Council approved Resolution No. 1244-2014 authorizing the City Manger to execute a new Program Income Reuse Agreement; and

WHEREAS the new Reuse Agreement was required due to Federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) changes to the Program Income reuse policy; and

WHEREAS the approved Reuse Agreement limits the use of Program Income to housing assistance, which is the source of most if not all of the City's Program Income; and

WHEREAS at the time of the approval of the new Reuse Agreement, the City's Owner Occupied Rehabilitation program was the only CDBG approved activity; and

WHEREAS since that time the City has adopted new Homebuyer Assistance Guidelines which were recently approved by the Department of Housing and Community Development; and

WHEREAS Program Income is currently limited to the approved housing activities, the City's Owner Occupied and Homebuyer Assistance Programs; and

WHEREAS the Council and staff met with Thomas Brandeberry in April of this year, the Section Chief for the State CDBG Program, to discuss the CDBG Program and how the City can best utilize the program to enhance the community; and

WHEREAS based on that meeting, Mr. Brandeberry convinced staff that the Housing Revolving Loan Fund (RLF) is not in the best interest of the City, because it limits the use of our Program Income to Owner Occupied Rehabilitation and Homebuyer Assistance loans; and

WHEREAS in May of this year, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 1259-2015 authorizing the City Manager to request that the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) rescind their approval of the City's Program Income Housing Revolving Loan Fund; and

WHEREAS staff was recently informed that the Housing RLF had been rescinded; and

WHEREAS the City is now required to make Supplemental Activity applications for other approved CDBG activities; and

WHEREAS the City desires to make two Supplemental Activity applications for: (1) improvements to the access to City Hall and the Police Department (Removal of Architectural Barriers); and (2) an Owner Occupied Rehabilitation (OOR) loan for Diane Brown for foundation repairs at 158 Birch Street; and

WHEREAS the City held a duly noticed Public Hearing on October 6, 2015 to receive input regarding the Supplemental Applications; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council hereby authorizes the City Manager to make two Supplemental Activity applications for: (1) improvements to the access to City Hall and the Police Department (Removal of Architectural Barriers); and (2) an Owner Occupied Rehabilitation (OOR) loan for Diane Brown for foundation repairs at 158 Birch Street; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Rio Dell directs staff to submit the Supplemental Applications to the Department of Housing and Community Development.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the forgoing Resolution was PASSED and ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Rio Dell on October 6, 2015 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Frank Wilson, Mayor

ATTEST:

I, Karen Dunham, City Clerk for the City of Rio Dell, State of California, hereby certify the above and foregoing to be a full, true and correct copy of Resolution No. 1272-2015 adopted by the City Council of the City of Rio Dell on October 6, 2015.

Karen Dunham


City Clerk, City of Rio Dell


675 Wildwood Avenue
Rio Dell, CA 95562
(707) 764-3532



For Meeting of: October 6, 2015

To: City Council

From: Kevin Caldwell, Community Development Director 

Through: Kyle Knopp, City Manager 

Date: September 28, 2015

Subject: Fence Regulations, Section 17.30.120 of the Rio Dell Municipal Code (RDMC)

Recommendation:

That the City Council:

1. Introduce (first reading) Ordinance No. 338-2015 amending the Fence Regulations to:
(1) allow ornamental fencing materials, such as wrought iron fences with or without masonry or wood posts/piers or cyclone fencing no taller than 7 feet provided the fence is at least 60% open, within the front yard setback and; (2) to prohibit razor or concertina wire fences.
2. Open the public hearing, receive public input, close the public hearing and continue consideration, approval and adoption of the proposed Ordinance to your meeting of October 20th, 2015 for the second reading and adoption.

Background and Discussion

Staff has been contacted on a number of occasions regarding constructing fences taller than four (4) feet within the front yard setback. The current fence regulations, Section 17.30.120 limits the height of fences within the front yard setback, typically twenty (20) feet in residential zones, to four (4) feet. Many jurisdictions allow taller fences in the front yard setback provided the fence materials do not obstruct the view through the fence.

As the Council is aware the 2013 California Building Coded (CBC) was amended to exempt fences up to seven (7) feet in height. The City amended the allowable height of fences last year to be consistent with the California Building Code.

Based on the review of other jurisdictions fencing regulations, staff recommended the following amendments to the fence regulations:

17.30.120 Fences, Walls and Screening

(1) Corner Lots -- Sight Distance.

In any residential district on a corner lot, there shall be no fence, wall, or hedge higher than three (3) feet, nor any obstruction to vision other than a post, column, or tree not exceeding one foot in diameter, between a height of three (3) feet and a height of ten (10) feet above the established grade of either street, within an area thirty (30) feet from the intersection of the street lot lines.

(2) Height Regulations.

~~Any fence or wall used as a fence shall not exceed a height of seven (7) feet within the required front, side, or rear yard of any lot; provided, however, that in any residential district, a fence or wall used as a fence shall not exceed a height of four (4) feet within a required front yard, nor seven (7) feet within any required rear yard or side yard, except where otherwise permitted by these regulations.~~

(a) Fences in Front Yards. A fence located in a front yard shall not exceed four (4) feet in height. However, an ornamental metal fence may be erected to a height of seven (7) feet. Such ornamental fence may include posts/piers constructed of masonry, wood or other similar materials, provided the fence is at least 60% open overall. An ornamental metal fence may also be constructed atop a masonry wall provided the combined height of the wall and fence does not exceed seven (7) feet and the portion of the wall/fence structure above 4 feet high is at least 60% open.

(b) Fences in Side Yards and Rear Yards. A fence located in a side yard or rear yard may be erected to a height of 7 (seven) feet.

(3) Exceptions.

The Planning Commission may modify by special use permit, the height requirements of this part, upon a showing of good cause. For any such modification, the Planning Commission shall be required to make the following findings:

- (a) The proposed fence height modification will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area;
- (b) The proposed modification will not be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site; and
- (c) The proposed modification will not jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare.

(d) In issuing a special use permit, the Planning Commission may require such changes or alterations in the fence as it may deem necessary to satisfy the findings specified in this part. Such changes or alterations may include, but shall not be limited to the following:

- Fence height
- Design
- Materials
- Setback from property line
- Screening or landscaping

(1) A fence or wall used as a fence which exceeds seven (7) feet in height shall be defined as a "detached accessory structure" for the purpose of regulation under the provisions of this ordinance, and all applicable provisions of the California Building Code shall apply. [Ord. 167 § 6.05.5 1982; Ord. 324 August 2014]

(4) Prohibited Materials.

The following fence materials are prohibited unless approved by the Community Development Director in consultation with the Director of Public Works and the Chief of Police for animal control, garden protection, special security needs, or required by a City, State, or Federal law or regulation.

(a) Barbed wire, or electrified fence, except within the Rural (R), and Natural Resources (NR) land use designations;

(b) Razor or concertina wire in conjunction with a fence or wall, or by itself within any land use designation;

(c) Nails, broken glass, or other sharp objects on the top of fences or walls.

(d) Existing fences with prohibited materials shall not be considered a legal non-conforming use and/or structure and shall be removed within sixty (60) days after adoption of the implementing ordinance.

Staff presented the recommended changes to the Planning Commission at their meeting of September 24th. The Commission concurred with staff's recommendations and is recommending that your Council approve the recommended amendments.

Procedural Requirements.

Pursuant to Section 17.35.010 of the City of Rio Dell Municipal Code, the following City procedures are required to amend the Ordinance:

- An amendment may be initiated by one or more owners of property affected by the proposed amendment, as set out in Section 17.35.010(3), or by action of the Planning Commission, or the City Council.
- The application of one or more property owners for the initiation of an amendment shall be filed in the office of the City Clerk on a form provided, accompanied by a filing fee.

- Subject only to the rules regarding the placing of matters on the Planning Commission agenda, the matter shall be set for a public hearing.
- Notice of hearing time and place shall be published once in a newspaper of general circulation at least ten calendar days before the hearing or by posting in at least three public places.
- At the public hearing, the Planning Commission shall hear any person affected by the proposed amendment. The hearing may be continued from time to time.
- Within 40 days of the conclusion of the hearing, the Planning Commission shall submit to the City Council a written report of recommendations and reasons therefore.
- Subject only to the rules regarding the placing of matters on its agenda, the City Council, at its next regular meeting following the receipt of such report, shall cause the matter to be set for a public hearing. Notice of the time and place of the hearing shall be given as provided in Section 17.35.010(5), hereof.
- At the public hearing, the City Council shall hear any person affected by the proposed amendment. The hearing may be continued to a specified future date, but shall be concluded within 60 days of the commencement thereof.
- The City Council shall not make any change in the proposed amendment until the proposed change has been referred to the Planning Commission for a report, and the Planning Commission report has been filed with the City Council.

Zone Reclassification Required Findings:

1. The proposed amendment is consistent and compatible with the General Plan and any implementation programs that may be affected.

There are no polices in the General Plan which would prohibit amending the fence regulations.

2. The proposed amendments have been processed in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Based on the nature of the project, staff has determined that the project is Statutorily Exempt pursuant to Section 15061(b) (3) of the CEQA Guidelines, Title 14, Chapter 3 of the California Code of Regulations. Pursuant to Section 15061(b) (3) of the CEQA Guidelines this exemption is covered by the general rule that CEQA applies only to projects which have the potential for causing a **significant** effect on the environment. Where it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the project in question may have a significant effect on the environment, the project is not subject to CEQA. Based on the nature of the proposed amendments, including the recommended Performance Standards, staff believes there is no evidence to suggest that the amendments will have a **significant** effect on the environment.

Attachments

Attachment 1: Existing Fence Regulations, Section 17.30.120 of the Rio Dell Municipal Code (RDMC) with the recommended changes.

Attachment 2: Ordinance No. 338-2015 amending the Fence Regulations to: (1) allow ornamental fencing materials, such as wrought iron fences with or without masonry or wood posts/piers or cyclone fencing no taller than 7 feet provided the fence is at least 60% open, within the front yard setback and; (2) to prohibit razor or concertina wire fences.

17.30.120 Fences, Walls and Screening**(1) Corner Lots -- Sight Distance.**

In any residential district on a corner lot, there shall be no fence, wall, or hedge higher than three (3) feet, nor any obstruction to vision other than a post, column, or tree not exceeding one foot in diameter, between a height of three (3) feet and a height of ten (10) feet above the established grade of either street, within an area thirty (30) feet from the intersection of the street lot lines.

(2) Height Regulations.

~~Any fence or wall used as a fence shall not exceed a height of seven (7) feet within the required front, side, or rear yard of any lot; provided, however, that in any residential district, a fence or wall used as a fence shall not exceed a height of four (4) feet within a required front yard, nor seven (7) feet within any required rear yard or side yard, except where otherwise permitted by these regulations.~~

(a) Fences in Front Yards. A fence located in a front yard shall not exceed four (4) feet in height. However, an ornamental metal fence may be erected to a height of seven (7) feet. Such ornamental fence may include posts/piers constructed of masonry, wood or other similar materials, provided the fence is at least 60% open overall. An ornamental metal fence may also be constructed atop a masonry wall provided the combined height of the wall and fence does not exceed seven (7) feet and the portion of the wall/fence structure above 4 feet high is at least 60% open.

(b) Fences in Side Yards and Rear Yards. A fence located in a side yard or rear yard may be erected to a height of 7 (seven) feet.

(3) Exceptions.

The Planning Commission may modify by special use permit, the height requirements of this part, upon a showing of good cause. For any such modification, the Planning Commission shall be required to make the following findings:

- (a) The proposed fence height modification will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area;
- (b) The proposed modification will not be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site; and
- (c) The proposed modification will not jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare.
- (d) In issuing a special use permit, the Planning Commission may require such changes or alterations in the fence as it may deem necessary to satisfy the findings specified in this part. Such changes or alterations may include, but shall not be limited to the following:

- Fence height
- Design
- Materials

- Setback from property line
- Screening or landscaping

(1) A fence or wall used as a fence which exceeds seven (7) feet in height shall be defined as a "detached accessory structure" for the purpose of regulation under the provisions of this ordinance, and all applicable provisions of the California Building Code shall apply. [Ord. 167 § 6.05.5 1982; Ord. 324 August 2014]

(4) Prohibited Materials.

The following fence materials are prohibited unless approved by the Community Development Director in consultation with the Director of Public Works and the Chief of Police for animal control, garden protection, special security needs, or required by a City, State, or Federal law or regulation.

(a) Barbed wire, or electrified fence, except within the Rural (R), and Natural Resources (NR) land use designations;

(b) Razor or concertina wire in conjunction with a fence or wall, or by itself within any land use designation;

(c) Nails, broken glass, or other sharp objects on the top of fences or walls.

(d) Existing fences with prohibited materials shall not be considered a legal non-conforming use and/or structure and shall be removed within sixty (60) days after adoption of the implementing ordinance.

ORDINANCE NO. 338-2015



**AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RIO DELL
AMENDING THE FENCE REGULATIONS, SECTION 17.30.120 OF THE RIO DELL
MUNICIPAL CODE:**

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RIO DELL ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:

WHEREAS staff has been contacted on a number of occasions regarding constructing fences taller than four (4) feet within the front yard setback; and

WHEREAS the current fence regulations, Section 17.30.120 limits the height of fences within the front yard setback, typically twenty (20) feet in residential zones, to four (4) feet; and

WHEREAS many jurisdictions allow taller fences in the front yard setback provided the fence materials do not obstruct the view through the fence; and

WHEREAS the City amended the allowable height of fences to seven (7) feet last year to be consistent with the California Building Code; and

WHEREAS the City has reviewed and processed the proposed amendment in conformance with Sections 65350 – 65362 of the California Government Code; and

WHEREAS the City has reviewed and processed the proposed amendment in conformance with Section 17.35.010 of the City of Rio Dell Municipal Code; and

WHEREAS the City finds that based on evidence on file and presented in the staff report that the proposed amendment is consistent and compatible with the General Plan and any implementation programs that may be affected; and

WHEREAS the proposed amendment has been processed in accordance with the applicable provisions of the California Government Code and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); and

WHEREAS staff presented the recommended changes to the Planning Commission at their meeting of September 24th; and

WHEREAS the Planning Commission concurred with staff's recommendations and is recommending that your Council approve the recommended amendments.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Rio Dell finds that:

1. The proposed amendments are consistent with the General Plan and any applicable specific plan; and
2. The proposed amendments are Statutorily Exempt pursuant to Section 15061(b) (3) of the CEQA Guidelines, Title 14, Chapter 3 of the California Code of Regulations.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Rio Dell does hereby ordain as follows:

Section 1. Section 17.30.120 of the Rio Dell Municipal Code is amended to read in as follows:

17.30.120 Fences, Walls and Screening

(1) Corner Lots -- Sight Distance.

In any residential district on a corner lot, there shall be no fence, wall, or hedge higher than three (3) feet, nor any obstruction to vision other than a post, column, or tree not exceeding one foot in diameter, between a height of three (3) feet and a height of ten (10) feet above the established grade of either street, within an area thirty (30) feet from the intersection of the street lot lines.

(2) Height Regulations.

~~Any fence or wall used as a fence shall not exceed a height of seven (7) feet within the required front, side, or rear yard of any lot; provided, however, that in any residential district, a fence or wall used as a fence shall not exceed a height of four (4) feet within a required front yard, nor seven (7) feet within any required rear yard or side yard, except where otherwise permitted by these regulations.~~

(a) Fences in Front Yards. A fence located in a front yard shall not exceed four (4) feet in height. However, an ornamental metal fence may be erected to a height of seven (7) feet. Such ornamental fence may include posts/piers constructed of masonry, wood or other similar materials, provided the fence is at least 60% open overall. An ornamental metal fence may also be constructed atop a masonry wall provided the combined height of the wall and fence does not exceed seven (7) feet and the portion of the wall/fence structure above 4 feet high is at least 60% open.

(b) Fences in Side Yards and Rear Yards. A fence located in a side yard or rear yard may be erected to a height of 7 (seven) feet.

(3) Exceptions.

The Planning Commission may modify by special use permit, the height requirements of this part, upon a showing of good cause. For any such modification, the Planning Commission shall be required to make the following findings:

- (a) The proposed fence height modification will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area;
- (b) The proposed modification will not be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site; and
- (c) The proposed modification will not jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare.
- (d) In issuing a special use permit, the Planning Commission may require such changes or alterations in the fence as it may deem necessary to satisfy the findings specified in this part. Such changes or alterations may include, but shall not be limited to the following:

- Fence height
- Design
- Materials
- Setback from property line
- Screening or landscaping

(1) A fence or wall used as a fence which exceeds seven (7) feet in height shall be defined as a "detached accessory structure" for the purpose of regulation under the provisions of this ordinance, and all applicable provisions of the California Building Code shall apply. [Ord. 167 § 6.05.5 1982; Ord. 324 August 2014]

(4) Prohibited Materials.

The following fence materials are prohibited unless approved by the Community Development Director in consultation with the Director of Public Works and the Chief of Police for animal control, garden protection, special security needs, or required by a City, State, or Federal law or regulation.

(a) Barbed wire, or electrified fence, except within the Rural (R), and Natural Resources (NR) land use designations;

(b) Razor or concertina wire in conjunction with a fence or wall, or by itself within any land use designation;

(c) Nails, broken glass, or other sharp objects on the top of fences or walls.

(d) Existing fences with prohibited materials shall not be considered a legal non-conforming use and/or structure and shall be removed within sixty (60) days after adoption of the implementing ordinance.

Section 2. Severability

If any provision of the ordinance is invalidated by any court of competent jurisdiction, the remaining provisions shall not be affected and shall continue in full force and effect.

Section 3. Limitation of Actions

Any action to challenge the validity or legality of any provision of this ordinance on any grounds shall be brought by court action commenced within ninety (90) days of the date of adoption of this ordinance.

Section 4. Effective Date

This ordinance becomes effective thirty (30) days after the date of its approval and adoption.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the forgoing Ordinance was duly introduced at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Rio Dell on October 6, 2015 and furthermore the forgoing Ordinance was passed, approved and adopted at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Rio Dell, held on the October 20, 2015 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Frank Wilson, Mayor

ATTEST:

I, Karen Dunham, City Clerk for the City of Rio Dell, State of California, hereby certify the above and foregoing to be a full, true and correct copy of Ordinance No. 338-2015 which was passed, approved and adopted at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Rio Dell, held on the October 20, 2015.

Karen Dunham, City Clerk, City of Rio Dell

CITY OF RIO DELL CHECK REGISTER

General Checking - US Bank of California

| Check | Date | Vendor | Description | Check / Payment |
|---------|-----------|--|---|-----------------|
| 0004028 | 8/05/2015 | [3975] AT&T - 5709 | PHONE EXPENSES FOR JULY 2015 | 521.00 |
| 0004029 | 8/05/2015 | [2261] CALIFORNIA STATE DISB UNIT | GARNISHMENT CASE #200000001183524 FOR PPE 7/2 | 81.69 |
| 0004030 | 8/05/2015 | [2285] CC MARKET (1) | BEHOLD LEMON & LYSOL CLEANER | 8.26 |
| 0004031 | 8/05/2015 | [2303] COAST CENTRAL CREDIT UNION | POA DUES FOR PPE 7/24/15 | 120.00 |
| 0004032 | 8/05/2015 | [2283] COASTAL BUSINESS SYSTEMS | DOCSTAR ANNUAL SOFTWARE LICENSE AGREEMENT FRO | 269.25 |
| 0004033 | 8/05/2015 | [4382] DOCUSTATION, INC. | MONTHLY MAINTENANCE & COPY CHARGES FOR JULY 2 | 579.75 |
| 0004034 | 8/05/2015 | [2366] EEL RIVER DISPOSAL INC | GARBAGE BAGS FOR JULY 2015 | 519.35 |
| 0004035 | 8/05/2015 | [5687] ENGINEERED FIRE SYSTEMS, INC. | PLAN REVIEW FOR THE MONTH OF JULY 2015 | 150.00 |
| 0004036 | 8/05/2015 | [2414] FRANCHISE TAX BOARD | EARNINGS WITHHOLDING ORDER FOR TAXES FOR PPE | 351.00 |
| 0004037 | 8/05/2015 | [4855] FRESHWATER ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES | CONSULTING FOR PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT FRO | 2,200.00 |
| 0004038 | 8/05/2015 | [5765] GARNES, DEBRA | CONSULTING & PROJECT MANAGEMENT FOR SSMP AUDI | 148.66 |
| 0004039 | 8/05/2015 | [2410] NORTH COAST CLEANING SERVICES, INC. | REIMBURSEMENT FOR 50TH ANNIVERSARY SUPPLIES | 471.00 |
| 0004040 | 8/05/2015 | [4393] NYLEX.net. Inc. | MONTHLY CLEANING SERVICE FOR JULY 2015 | 900.00 |
| 0004041 | 8/05/2015 | [5222] R.J. RICCIARDI, INC | MONTHLY MAINTENANCE FOR AUGUST 15, 2015 THROU | 175.00 |
| 0004042 | 8/05/2015 | [2742] SCOTIA TRUE VALUE HARDWARE | PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 7 | 166.28 |
| 0004043 | 8/05/2015 | [4525] SHERLOCK RECORDS MGMT | 4 NICKEL PLATED KEYS | 92.20 |
| 0004044 | 8/05/2015 | [2710] STARPAGE | NEVERKINK HOSE; ADJ HD NOZZLE; BRASS CONNECTO | 12.95 |
| 0004045 | 8/05/2015 | [2481] VANTAGEPOINT TRANSFER AGENTS-304361 | 4G CONTRACTOR SUPER GLUE | 5,394.08 |
| 0004046 | 8/05/2015 | [2772] WENDT CONSTRUCTION, INC | 1.1 GAL HOME DEFENSE KILLER; 16" 3 SPEED OSC | 11,145.00 |
| 0004047 | 8/12/2015 | [0576] 101 AUTO PARTS | 2 ADJ SPRAYERS; 100 PK SGL EDGE BLADES | 292.17 |
| 0004048 | 8/12/2015 | [5443] AIRGAS USA, LLC | STORAGE SERVICE & BOX RETRIEVAL FOR JULY 2015 | |
| | | | PAGING SERVICES FOR THE MONTH OF AUGUST 2015 | |
| | | | RETIREMENT FOR PPE 7/24/15 | |
| | | | MONUMENT ROAD 30" CULVERT REPLACEMENT; 12 TON | |
| | | | TWO GAL 15W40; ONE 80 PK TERRY RAGS; POWER SE | |
| | | | 3MM MASKING TAPE | |
| | | | 24 QTS 10W30 | |
| | | | GAS TANK 6 GAL LOW FOR MOWER | |
| | | | FUEL LINE ASSEMBLY; HOSE END; FUEL FILTER FOR CYLINDER RENTAL | |
| | | | | 21.00 |

CITY OF RIO DELL CHECK REGISTER

General Checking - US Bank of California

| Check | Date | Vendor | Description | Check / Payment |
|---------|-----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 0004049 | 8/12/2015 | [5330] CAPITAL ONE COMMERCIAL | COSTCO - 4 PK LAMINATE TAPE FOR LABEL MAKER | 42.99 |
| 0004050 | 8/12/2015 | [2293] CITY OF FORTUNA | POLICE DISPATCH SERVICES FOR AUGUST 2015 | 2,075.00 |
| 0004051 | 8/12/2015 | [2302] CLYDE'S TOWING, INC. | TOW UTILITY TRAILER & DISPOSAL OF TRASH AT 20 | 397.00 |
| 0004052 | 8/12/2015 | [2283] COASTAL BUSINESS SYSTEMS | LABOR TO RE-SETUP FAX MACHINE IN POLICE DEPT | 77.50 |
| 0004053 | 8/12/2015 | [5127] DELTA DENTAL | SETUP NEW PANASONIC DOCSTAR SCANNER | 2,427.53 |
| 0004054 | 8/12/2015 | [5241] GE CAPITAL | DENTAL INSURANCE FOR SEPTEMBER 2015 | 482.13 |
| 0004055 | 8/12/2015 | [2423] GEORGE'S GLASS | XEROX COPIER PAYMENT FOR AUGUST 2015 | 314.00 |
| 0004056 | 8/12/2015 | [5052] GHD, INC | WINDSHIELD REPLACEMENT FOR 2004 JEEP LIBERTY | 15.24 |
| 0004057 | 8/12/2015 | [5594] GIBSON, WANDA | ENGINEERING SERVICES - POSTAGE FOR ATP APPLIC | 176.74 |
| 0004058 | 8/12/2015 | [5701] RACHEL HARTSOE | CUSTOMER DEPOSIT REFUND | 213.53 |
| 0004059 | 8/12/2015 | [2452] HORIZON BUSINESS PRODUCTS | SEAL, 2" DIA GD, 44/PK - FOR CERTIFICATES PRE | 4.84 |
| 0004060 | 8/12/2015 | [5408] JOHN MAGUIRE | CUSTOMER DEPOSIT REFUND | 14.22 |
| 0004061 | 8/12/2015 | [4908] MITCHELL BRISSE DELANEY & VRIEZE | LEGAL SERVICES FOR JULY 2015 | 2,452.90 |
| 0004062 | 8/12/2015 | [2570] NILSEN COMPANY | LEGAL SERVICES FOR JULY 2015 | 58.30 |
| 0004063 | 8/12/2015 | [2603] PG&E | LEGAL SERVICES FOR JULY 2015 | 17,681.51 |
| 0004064 | 8/12/2015 | [4338] QUILL CORPORATION | LEGAL SERVICES FOR JULY 2015 | 313.57 |
| 0004065 | 8/12/2015 | [2655] RENNER PETROLEUM | LEGAL SERVICES FOR JULY 2015 | 583.93 |
| 0004066 | 8/12/2015 | [2742] SCOTIA TRUE VALUE HARDWARE | TWO QUARTS ROUNDUP POISON IVY | 20.19 |
| 0004067 | 8/12/2015 | [2319] SUDDENLINK COMMUNICATIONS | UTILITY EXPENSES FOR JULY 2015 | 134.95 |
| 0004068 | 8/20/2015 | [2237] BANK OF AMERICA BUSINESS CARD | ONE BOX PRECISE FINE POINT PENS | 3,572.92 |
| 0004069 | 8/20/2015 | [2261] CALIFORNIA STATE DISB UNIT | XTRA 3 SHELF UTILITY CART | |
| 0004070 | 8/20/2015 | [2285] CC MARKET (1) | 200 GAL DYED DIESEL FUEL FOR GENERATOR AT COR | |
| 0004071 | 8/20/2015 | [2303] COAST CENTRAL CREDIT UNION | TORX KEY DRIVER | |
| 0004072 | 8/20/2015 | [2414] FRANCHISE TAX BOARD | 1/2" GALV COUPLING/STOP; 1/2X5 GALV NIPPLE | |
| | | | INTERNET SERVICE FROM 8/10/15 THROUGH 9/9/15 | |
| | | | INTERNATIONAL CODE COUNCIL - CA RESIDENTIAL | |
| | | | B G NORTHCUTT GROUP - CAMERA MONITOR & DVR | |
| | | | LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES 2015 ANNUAL CONFE | |
| | | | CSMFO - INTERMEDIATE GOVERNMENT | 81.69 |
| | | | GARNISHMENT CASE #200000001183524 FOR PPE | |
| | | | 8/7 | |
| | | | TWO CAKES FOR CITY OF RIO DELL 50TH ANNIVERSA | 100.00 |
| | | | POA DUES FOR PPE 8/7/15 | |
| | | | EARNINGS WITHHOLDING ORDER FOR TAXES FOR PPE | 120.00 |
| | | | | 351.00 |

CITY OF RIO DELL CHECK REGISTER

General Checking - US Bank of California

| Check | Date | Vendor | Description | Check / Payment |
|---------|-----------|--|---|-----------------|
| 0004073 | 8/20/2015 | [2691] HUMBOLDT SENIOR RESOURCE CENTER/ADULT DAY HEALTH, INC | TRANSPORTATION FUNDS FY 15/16 | 6,500.00 |
| 0004074 | 8/20/2015 | [2742] SCOTIA TRUE VALUE HARDWARE | 4 PK GIANT DESTROYER & LIGHTER TWO 4 PK GIANT DESTROYER & LIGHTER TWO SCOOP SHOVELS; ONE DIG SHOVEL; TWO 90W HA | 130.23 |
| 0004075 | 8/20/2015 | [2694] SHELL OIL CO. | PD FUEL EXPENSES FOR JULY 2015 PW FUEL EXPENSES FOR JULY 2015 FUEL EXPENSES FOR ADMIN CAR FOR JULY 2015 PD FUEL EXPENSES FOR AUGUST 2015 PW FUEL EXPENSES FOR AUGUST 2015 OIL CHANGE FOR 2014 FORD INTERCEPTOR SHREDDING | 2,164.01 |
| 0004076 | 8/20/2015 | [2693] SHELTON'S AUTO LUBE | WATER DISCHARGE PERMIT FOR WATER PLANT | 49.28 |
| 0004077 | 8/20/2015 | [4570] SHRED AWARE | ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATION FOR POLICE DEPAR | 115.00 |
| 0004078 | 8/20/2015 | [4177] STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BRD | ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATION FOR POLICE DEPAR | 500.00 |
| 0004079 | 8/20/2015 | [4152] STOKES & ASSOCIATES, DBA | ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATION FRO POLICE DEPAR | 3,742.76 |
| 0004080 | 8/20/2015 | [2481] VANTAGEPOINT TRANSFER AGENTS-304361 | RETIEMENT FOR PPE 8/7/15 | 5,404.45 |
| 0004081 | 8/20/2015 | [5613] KELLY O'HERN ASSOCIATES | EEL RIVER SAWMILL AREA ROAD MAP | 10,000.00 |
| 0004082 | 8/27/2015 | [2224] AQUA BEN CORPORATION | HYDROFLOC 750L 55 GAL DRUM | 814.23 |
| 0004083 | 8/27/2015 | [5769] BLUE SHIELD OF CALIFORNIA | HEALTH INSURANCE FOR SEPTEMBER 2015 | 16,778.40 |
| 0004084 | 8/27/2015 | [3206] CALIFORNIA POLICE CHIEFS ASSOCIATION | ANNUAL MEMBERSHIP DUES JULY 1, 2015 TO JUNE 3 | 315.00 |
| 0004085 | 8/27/2015 | [3883] DARRYL J SELBY DBA SUPERIOR INSTALLS | INSTALL IN CAR VIDEO CAMERA SYSTEM - CHIEFS' LIFE INSURANCE FOR SEPTEMBER 2015 | 300.00 |
| 0004086 | 8/27/2015 | [2411] DEARBORN NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY | LIFE INSURANCE FOR SEPTEMBER 2015 | 232.00 |
| 0004087 | 8/27/2015 | [4382] DOCUSTATION, INC. | MONTHLY MAINTENANCE & COPY CHARGES FOR AUGUST | 573.35 |
| 0004088 | 8/27/2015 | [2405] FORTUNA ACE HARDWARE | 6HP UTILITY PUMP; 1" POLY ELBOW INSERT; 1"x2" CONSULTING - PROJECT PERFORMANCE REPORT 7/20/ | 144.07 |
| 0004089 | 8/27/2015 | [4855] FRESHWATER ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES | ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR CIP WATER PROJECT TOTAL + FECAL COLIFORM 3 X 5 PREPARE AND SEND ANNUAL LABOR COMPLIANCE REPO | 2,960.00 |
| 0004090 | 8/27/2015 | [5052] GHD, INC | ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR CIP WATER PROJECT TOTAL + FECAL COLIFORM 3 X 5 | 3,990.75 |
| 0004091 | 8/27/2015 | [2569] NORTH COAST LABORATORIES, INC. | PREPARE AND SEND ANNUAL LABOR COMPLIANCE REPO | 65.00 |
| 0004092 | 8/27/2015 | [5101] NORTH VALLEY LABOR COMPLIANCE SERVICES | REPO | 75.00 |
| 0004093 | 8/27/2015 | [4338] QUILL CORPORATION | LASER BUSINESS CARD STOCK RIBBONS FOR RECEIPT PRINTERS DELL LED MONITOR | 207.06 |
| 0004094 | 8/27/2015 | [3032] RENDEZVOUS MUSIC & VENDING | COFFEE | 63.00 |
| 0004095 | 8/27/2015 | [2742] SCOTIA TRUE VALUE HARDWARE | TWO 5/16" WIRE ROPE CLIPS UPS SHIPPING CHARGES 15A IVY SP TOG SWITCH BIG GRIP CULTIVATOR RAKE; 8LBS HI TRAFFIC SEE | 105.07 |

**CITY OF RIO DELL
CHECK REGISTER****General Checking - US Bank of California**

| <u>Check</u> | <u>Date</u> | <u>Vendor</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Check / Payment</u> |
|--------------|-------------|----------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| 0004096 | 8/27/2015 | [2709] STAPLES DEPT. 00-04079109 | AT A GLANCE WALL CALENDAR JULY - JUNE MICR BLACK TONER CARTRIDGE FOR HP LASER PRINT | 207.74 |
| 0004097 | 8/31/2015 | [2757] US POSTMASTER | SWINGLINE STAPLER POSTAGE FOR THE MONTH OF AUGUST 2015 FOR UTI | 375.55 |
| | | | Total Checks/Deposits | 111,142.27 |

